

**FAKULTA PŘÍRODOVĚDNĚ-HUMANITNÍ A
PEDAGOGICKÁ**

Katedra: Anglického jazyka
Studijní program: Učitelství pro střední školy
Studijní obor: Anglický jazyk – Občanská výchova

MICHAEL MOORE VERSUS GEORGE W.
BUSH: VYTVÁŘENÍ ILUZE REALITY SKRZE
ŽÁNŘ DOKUMENTÁRNÍHO
FILMU – *FAHRENHEIT 9/11*
MICHAEL MOORE VERSUS GEORGE W.
BUSH: CREATING THE ILLUSION OF
REALITY THROUGH THE GENRE OF THE
DOCUMENTARY FILM – *FAHRENHEIT 9/11*

Diplomová práce: 13-FP-KAJ- 0160

Autor:
Lenka VOLEJNÍKOVÁ

Podpis:

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Zénó Vernyik, Ph.D.

Počet

stran	grafů	obrázků	tabulek	pramenů	příloh
84	0	0	0	69	1 CD

V Liberci dne: 20. 11. 2013

ZADÁNÍ DIPLOMOVÉ PRÁCE

(PROJEKTU, UMĚLECKÉHO DÍLA, UMĚLECKÉHO VÝKONU)

Jméno a příjmení: Bc. Lenka Volejníková
Osobní číslo: P11000861
Studijní program: N7504 Učitelství pro střední školy
Studijní obory: Učitelství anglického jazyka pro 2. stupeň základní školy
Učitelství všeobecně vzdělávacích předmětů pro základní školy
a střední školy - základy společenských věd
Název tématu: Michael Moore versus George W. Bush: Vytváření iluze reality
skrže žánr dokumentárního filmu - Fahrenheit 9/11.
Zadávající katedra: Katedra anglického jazyka

Z á s a d y p r o v y p r a c o v á n í :

Cílem práce je ukázat, že M. Moore využívá žánrové proudy dokumentu, aby vytvořil iluzi pravdivosti a reality.

Metody:

- 1) studium odborné literatury.
- 2) porovnání reprezentace prezidenta George W. Bushe ve filmu Fahrenheit 9/11 a v literatuře faktu.
- 3) analýza použití žánrových prvků k vytvoření iluze reality.

Rozsah grafických prací:

Rozsah pracovní zprávy:

Forma zpracování diplomové práce: tištěná/elektronická

Seznam odborné literatury:

- Alexander, A., and Jarice H. 1995. Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in Mass Media and Society. Connecticut: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.
- Campbell, N., and Alasdair K. 1997. American Cultural Studies: An Introduction to American Culture. New York: Routledge.
- Giles, D. 2003. Media Psychology. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Laurent, E. 2003. Dynastie Bushů. Praha: Euromedia Group, k. s. - Knižní klub.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994. Picture Theory. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Moore, M. 2004. Fahrenheit 9/11. Santa Monica, CA: Lions Gate Entertainment.
- Panchyk, R. 2008. Keys to American History: Understanding Our Most Important Historic Documents. Chicago: Chicago Review Press.

Vedoucí diplomové práce:

Mgr. Zénó Vernyik

Katedra anglického jazyka

Datum zadání diplomové práce: 27. dubna 2012

Termín odevzdání diplomové práce: 26. dubna 2013



doc. RNDr. Miroslav Brzezina, CSc.

děkan

L.S.



PhDr. Marcela Malá, M.A., Ph.D.

vedoucí katedry

V Liberci dne 27. dubna 2012

Čestné prohlášení

Název práce: Michael Moore versus George W. Bush: Vytváření iluze reality skrze žánr dokumentárního filmu – *Fahrenheit 9/11*

Jméno a příjmení autora: Lenka Volejníková

Osobní číslo: P11000861

Byl/a jsem seznámen/a s tím, že na mou diplomovou práci se plně vztahuje zákon č. 121/2000 Sb. o právu autorském, právech souvisejících s právem autorským a o změně některých zákonů (autorský zákon), ve znění pozdějších předpisů, zejména § 60 – školní dílo.

Prohlašuji, že má diplomová práce je ve smyslu autorského zákona výhradně mým autorským dílem.

Beru na vědomí, že Technická univerzita v Liberci (TUL) nezasahuje do mých autorských práv užitím mé diplomové práce pro vnitřní potřebu TUL.

Užiji-li diplomovou práci nebo poskytnu-li licenci k jejímu využití, jsem si vědom povinnosti informovat o této skutečnosti TUL; v tomto případě má TUL právo ode mne požadovat úhradu nákladů, které vynaložila na vytvoření díla, až do jejich skutečné výše.

Diplomovou práci jsem vypracoval/a samostatně s použitím uvedené literatury a na základě konzultací s vedoucím diplomové práce a konzultantem.

Prohlašuji, že jsem do informačního systému STAG vložil/a elektronickou verzi mé diplomové práce, která je identická s tištěnou verzí předkládanou k obhajobě a uvedl/a jsem všechny systémem požadované informace pravdivě.

V Liberci dne: 20. 11. 2013

Lenka Volejníková

Anotace:

Diplomová práce s názvem „Michael Moore versus George W. Bush: Vytváření iluze reality skrze žánr dokumentárního filmu – *Fahrenheit 9/11*“ se zabývá analýzou snímku *Fahrenheit 9/11*, jeho obsahem a užitými prvky a technikami. Film je řazen pod hlavičku dokumentárního filmu, ale cílem této práce je dokázat, že by měl nést označení „docu-ganda“, nebo-li spojení dokumentárního filmu s prvky propagandy. Práce je rozdělena do dvou částí. Teoretická část se zabývá tématy jako média, kultura, dokumentární film, docu-ganda a tím, jak si tyto fenomény pohrávají s koncepty pravdy, polopravdy a lži, a tak vytvářejí realitu případně to, co ji jen připomíná – realismus. V praktické části je samotný rozbor prvků, které jsou obvykle užívány k manipulaci s davem.

Klíčová slova: masová média, masová/populární/vysoká/nízká kultura, dokumentární film, docu-ganda film, realita, realismus, techniky propagandy.

Annotation:

The master's thesis called “Michael Moore versus George W. Bush: Creating the Illusion of Reality through the Genre of the Documentary Film – *Fahrenheit 9/11*” deals with the analysis of the film *Fahrenheit 9/11*, its content, features and techniques used. The film is said to be a documentary, but the aim of the thesis is to prove that the film is rather so called “docu-ganda” - documentary and propaganda. The paper is divided into two parts: theoretical and practical. The theoretical part is concerned with the issues such as media, culture, documentary film and docu-ganda film and how these can play with the concepts of truth, half-truth or lie; thus, create either reality or something which reality only resembles - realism. The practical part

is the analysis of the features used in the film which are typically used in order to manipulate and persuade the masses.

Key words: mass media, mass/popular/high/low culture, documentary film, docu-ganda film, reality, realism, propaganda techniques.

Contents

Introduction	6
1 Media World and “Reality” Versus “Realism”	10
2 Culture and Mass Media.....	16
2.1 Documentary Film as a Mass Medium.....	24
3 Truth, Half-truth or Falsehood?.....	31
3.1 Documentary film.....	32
3.2 Docu-ganda film.....	36
3.3 Documentary Film – Reality; Docu-ganda Film – Realism.....	39
4 <i>Fahrenheit 9/11</i>	41
4.1 <i>Fahrenheit 9/11</i> : Content and Reviews.....	41
5 Propaganda Techniques Used in <i>Fahrenheit 9/11</i>	46
5.1 Celebrities Endorsement.....	47
5.2 Contextualization.....	50
5.3 Music.....	56
5.4 Half – truths.....	61
5.4.1 The USA and Saudi Arabia Relationship.....	62
5.4.2 George W. Bush and Veterans.....	66
Conclusion.....	72
References.....	77

Introduction

“Good night, and good luck” is a famous closing phrase of a television newsman, Edward R. Murrow, who confronted Senator Joseph McCarthy and the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations (Government Operations Committee). Murrow and his CBS staff tried to examine the lies and tactics used by the senator in his communist “witch-hunts,” even though they were in danger of being accused themselves. What Murrow and his colleagues aimed at was showing the reality of what only seemed real. They focused on showing what was under the cover. They took advantage of a mass medium – television – to illuminate current events and trials.

The aim of this paper is to show that the same was done by Michael Moore, but with rather an opposite purpose. Michael Moore, the director of *Fahrenheit 9/11*, also uses a mass medium – the documentary – to present what stands behind the terrorist attacks which happened in the USA in 2001 and behind Bush’s administration. He also tries to reveal what is under the cover, but with the difference that he does not focus on reality. He chooses to use real events and people to create an illusion of truthfulness. As it is to be shown below, the tactics used in the film are manipulative and persuasive and do not allow the audience to form their own opinion.

Mass media has a significant impact on how we perceive the reality we live in, which also raises the question whether it is actually real and not only something resembling it. One of the powerful media which shapes people’s attitudes and opinions is a film.

Moreover, as McLuhan (2011) says, “Film is not really a single medium like song or the written word, but a collective art form with different individuals directing color, lighting, sound, acting, speaking. (304)¹”

Documentary film is even stronger in its message due to its aim to present issues as they really happened and not to deceive the audience by any techniques or exaggerated assertions. It does not claim to be completely objective, because the point of view is always characteristic of the filmmaker. However, it claims not to mislead the people, but rather give the audience insight into the situation.

The paper is also not a defense of the former American president G. W. Bush or an attempt to paint an ideal picture of him. He did a lot of things well during his presidency, but as every human being, he did not avoid mistakes or bad decisions. The purpose of the thesis is also not to denigrate Michael Moore and his opinions or behaviour.

The objective of this thesis is to prove that Michael Moore did not actually make a documentary film, but a so called “docu-ganda”. Docu-ganda uses elements of a documentary film, but in a propagandistic way. Via analyzing the tactics, techniques and features present in the film, I would like to show that the film cannot be considered a documentary in its essence, but deserves the label “docu-ganda.”

The analysis covers the issue of media in general and their huge impact on society nowadays. Media are connected with two terms – “reality” and “realism”. What one often thinks is that what is being presented in the news, radio, the Internet etc. is true and real, but it does not necessarily have to be. “Reality” and “realism” sound similar, but their substance is different. Media often only creates the illusion of

¹ Film ve skutečnosti není pouze jediným médiem jako píseň nebo psané slovo, nýbrž kolektivní uměleckou formou, kde různí jednotlivci ovládají barvu, osvětlení, zvuk, herce a slovo. (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

reality, works with real events and people, but there is no guarantee that what is shown is exactly what happened. Consequently, what is being created is not reality, but the culture or society of realism.

Society and media are interconnected vessels in which one creates the other. “[T]he media are not monolithic but are an enormously diverse set of messages, images, and ideas that can be said to originate in society and sent back to society.” (Alexander 1995, xii) Our culture is labeled by adjectives such as mass, popular or high and low. These terms sometimes overlap or are not distinguished at all. However, it becomes crucial to see the difference between these cultures and the role of media in them. From that reason one can only understand how society is driven by media and how one can either participate in the process or avoid doing so.

Documentary film is also a product of a culture and is considered a mass medium. Its influence on the masses is not subtle. The intention to address the audience and show them a certain point of view on an issue was present from the very beginnings of the genre and remains nowadays. Therefore the genre is, and can be considered a mass medium and it is used so. The genre of the documentary plays with words such as truth, half-truth and lie; therefore, these terms are necessary to put under scrutiny in order to distinguish what predominates in a documentary film, and likewise, a docu-ganda. The concept of truth is not an easy issue and is a common topic of many debates and discussions. Nevertheless, the aim is not to say what the truth is and what it is not, but to name techniques which can distort, change or destroy the picture of an event as it actually happened.

The final part of the thesis deals with propaganda techniques themselves used in *Fahrenheit 9/11* such as celebrities’ endorsement, contextualization and music. Michael Moore’s film does not say the complete truth, but often shows only one side

of it. He cannot be accused of lying and in that sense the tactic appears even more unassailable. However, even if it does not appear so, it is, in fact, assailable as it could be seen in the chapters “The USA and Saudi Arabia Relationship” and “George W. Bush and Veterans.”

Based on the assumptions of the unfair practice used in the film, one can say that it is not a coincidence that *Fahrenheit 9/11* raised so much controversy and became an issue of many reviewers or common people. It is a film which gained many awards and nominations; on the other hand, it is one which should not be considered a documentary.

The claim that “‘the camera cannot lie’ just simply stresses all kinds of frauds which are done on its behalf”² (McLuhan 2011, 204) talks about cameras in general and indirectly about the huge power of the film industry. Michael Moore speaks the claim himself in his film more than any other filmmaker does. He tries so hard to prove what we see in the film is true, that he simply turns the attention of the public on the frauds and deceitful practices, rather than on the fact he is simply expressing his own point of view.

² Tvzení, že „kamera neumí lhát“, však pouze podtrhuje všemožné podvody, které jsou dnes páhány jejím jménem. (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

1 Media World and “Reality” Versus “Realism”

Life in the twenty - first century might seem more uncomplicated than that of several hundred years ago. People do not have to fear for lack of food, clothes, impossibility to get effective medicine, a long way travel or bad weather as previous generations did. People learnt how to protect themselves against natural conditions and fulfilled not only their basic human needs, but also their extra needs. On the other hand, present days bring new challenges into our lives that were not present before. In particular, these challenges are not connected with physical survival, but rather with the mental one. The more society is developed, the more possibilities of access to information it offers. This leads not only to an increasing amount of these sources, but also to the question which sources are truthful and which updates are worth believing. The challenge is “mass media” and their way of presenting issues.

There are various mass media which are used by people in everyday life. From these we can see and get to know what happened in our state or in the countries all over the world. We can choose from using the Internet, telephones, broadcast, radio, audio recordings, audio-visual recordings, books, magazines, newspapers, etc. in order to gain a particular picture. Marshall McLuhan understands the term “media” in a very broad sense: “He includes not only mass media such as newspapers, broadcast or television, but also writing and book printing; moreover, material technical inventions such as a bicycle, weapons, transportation, cars etc.”³ (2011, from the cover) In addition, he claims that “each new medium shapes society by its own terms, so we can never have a universal definition of ‘media’ - the concept is forever in a state of flux.”(1967, 11)

³Pojem médií chápe McLuhan velmi široce: zahrnuje do něho nejen sdělovací prostředky jako noviny, rozhlas a televizi, ale i písmo, knihtisk, ba i hmotné technické vynálezy jako kolo, zbraně, dopravní spoje, auta atd. (translated by the author of the Master’ thesis)

He then explains that “Media are effectively ciphers (i.e. empty of meaning) until we perceive some form of content, which is then treated as a message. The electric light is devoid of content until it is used to convey an explicit message, such as an advertising slogan or brand name, or until we credit it with a particular meaning (such as “light pollution”). Therefore McLuhan says ‘the medium is the message.’” (Giles 2003, 6 – 7)

The balance of power between mass media is a hot issue nowadays. There is a fight over which medium brings the information in the shortest time period, in the most interesting way and with as much impact on the society as possible. Jean Baudrillard was one of the postmodern representatives of such thinking. He believed in a huge impact of media on the society. In accordance with his belief, media have depoliticised the masses, creating lack of will, so people are content to sit back and luxuriate in the “ecstasy of communication.”(1985, 126)

On the other hand, what is positive about the influence and media-overload is that society changes into media savvy individuals who try not to get lost in this world of information. The media has become a vital part of our lives and they form the beliefs, values and opinions of society. As McLuhan says, “The medium [...] is reshaping and restructuring patterns of social interdependence and every aspect of our personal life. It is forcing us to reconsider and reevaluate practically every thought, every action, and every institution formerly taken for granted. Everything is changing – you, your family, your neighborhood, your education, your job, your government, your relation to ‘the others’. And they are changing dramatically.” (1967, 8)

Media has, in that sense, changed the whole picture of the world, but this picture might often be distorted. The crucial is to be aware of the huge power the

media has and to understand what stands behind the strength and respond to it; thus, keep the balance between these two worlds. “Pope Pius XII highly cared about the issue of media to become the subject of serious studies. He said on February 17, 1950: ‘It is not exaggerated to claim that the future of human society and its inner life stability are to some extent dependent on keeping the balance between the power of communication technologies and the ability of an individual to respond to them.’”⁴ (McLuhan 2011, 34)

For that reason we should try to assure that what is being presented to us is true. No doubt, some preservation of critical distance is essential. A child becomes literate when they start attending a primary school and keep and improve their knowledge throughout their whole life. Reading, counting or writing are more than important to master, however, being a literate person is not enough in this over-loaded information era. What is demanding, and inevitable, is becoming a media-literate person.

Lynette Sheridan Burns says: “‘Truth’ has never been harder to define because information comes to us quickly from all over the globe, overwhelming our ability to sort out ‘the truth.’” (2002, 23)

In other words, today’s world raises questions which are asked more than ever before. “What is true and what is false?” “What we should believe in and what do we reject as implausible?” “What is the difference between presenting ‘reality’ and what just seems to be ‘reality’?” “What is ‘reality,’ indeed?”

To find the answers to the questions, it is first important to distinguish between two terms, which are beyond any doubt associated with the mass media world. These

⁴Papeži Píovi XII. velmi záleželo na tom, aby se v naší době média stala předmětem vážného studia. 17. února 1950 řekl: „Není přehnané tvrzení, že budoucnost dnešní společnosti a stabilita jejího vnitřního života do značné míry závisejí na udržení rovnováhy mezi silou komunikačních technik a schopností jednotlivce na ně reagovat.“ (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

terms are “reality” and “realism.” They might sound and look identical, since they share the same root. However, they both mean something different.

In *Webster’s Universal Dictionary and Thesaurus* “reality” is described as “the fact or condition of being real; an actual fact or thing; truth.” (1993, 437) In this sense reality appears as the state of things which are factual. It is considered true and presenting things as they really are. Looking back to ancient Greece and then philosophy, which is a cornerstone of the thoughts about what is and what is not reality, we can find out those then philosophers and thinkers were determined to solve a similar problem as we try to solve now. Of course it cannot be compared with today’s life and society because those were the first attempts for a developed society and thinking. Nevertheless, the Greeks at that time attempted to find what the real world was like and what only appeared to be real. Plato in his *Parable of the Cave* in the book *The Republic* shows the discrepancy between the world of deep thinking which is real for him, and the other world, which is connected with what people are used to and do not try to doubt. They trust it blindly and become slaves who do not consider the real matters. In the following excerpt from the Plato’s book, one can see the difference between being a slave and a freeman.

And now look again, and see what will naturally follow if the prisoners are released and disabused of their error. At first, when any of them is liberated and compelled suddenly to stand up and turn his neck round and walk and look towards the light, he will suffer sharp pains; the glare will distress him, and he will be unable to see the realities of which in his former state he had seen the shadows; and then conceive some one saying to him, that what he saw before was an illusion, but that now, when he is approaching nearer to being and his

eye is turned towards more real existence, he has a clearer vision [...].
(360 B.C.E., Book VII)

Although Plato lived more than 2000 years ago, he noticed that thinking and not accepting things as they are shown and presented, is the best way to see the truth and become free. Therefore reality is what one should seek and not to be content with realism.

In contrast to reality, the term realism is considered a “practical outlook” in accordance to *Webster’s Universal Dictionary and Thesaurus* (1993, 437). In other words it is a relationship between reality and how it is presented. It may be present events or situations that are highly possible to happen, or those that actually happened. However, there is no assurance that what is shown is presented exactly in the same way it occurred. The analysis of this term can be found in a publication *Realism and Reality in Film and Media*. In particular, an author of the chapter called “The Experience of Realism in Audiovisual Representation,” Torben Grodal, perceives realism as “a word used in order to describe a relationship between representations and physical and social reality ‘exterior’ to such representations. Realism may be applied to fictitious as well as to non-fictitious representations; because realism does not imply that what has been represented is true and ‘real’ in all aspects.” (2002, 68)

Mass media changes reality into realism and vice versa. “They deliver a view of the world, re-present reality, and inevitably we need to be aware of the ways in which those media transform, distort and re-process the ‘reality’ which they present to us.” (Glyndŵr University 2012)

To conclude, today’s world is undoubtedly connected with a media culture and a huge information-overload. As people living in this fast and media-full society, we

should try to learn and recognize what is worth believing and what is not. We see a lot of material, hear a lot of information and make certain logical or sometimes illogical conclusions while reflecting on it. However it does not necessarily mean that the findings are true, because the input may likely be false. One of the biggest challenges of the twenty-first century is to avoid doing what Jon Katz noticed when talking about media and technologies: “We see with other eyes; we hear with other ears; we think with other thoughts than those we formerly used.”(Campbell 1997, 272)

2 Culture and Mass Media

The concept of mass media is interconnected with twenty-first century society to such a degree that one seems inconceivable without the other one. Everywhere we go and whatever we do, we are basically influenced by mass media. The best illustration of such reliance is our choice of purchasing products. One does not buy a particular kind of a chair, but rather one that she/he saw in a commercial on TV. Regarding clothes, one does not wear dresses with hats and a fine pair of shoes because they see or hear what it means to be “trendy” these days. One starts to date much earlier than one used to. Is that a new trend? Yes. However, the new trend seems to be unconsciously connected with all that surrounds us starting from sexist dolls, clothes and lipstick for 6 year old girls which are shown on billboards. The pressure of mass media on our society is huge and they partially form the look of the society. According to Communication for Governance and Accountability Program⁵ “Media consumption may affect a person’s thoughts, emotions, or behaviors in ways that could be direct or indirect, immediate or delayed, fleeting or lasting.” (The World Bank 2011) On the other hand, if there were no receivers, the media would lose their meaning and there would be no one to influence or keep updated on the issues. The receivers play a significant role and can be divided into particular groups on the basis of how fast they get or receive what is being presented to them; nevertheless, at the end the information reaches the ears of the masses.

“Often the media first spreads the word about a new idea, but ever-widening interpersonal networks persuade individuals to make the change. Over time, family,

⁵ CommGAP, a global program at the World Bank, promotes the use of communication in governance reform programs and supports the building of democratic public spheres. Through its three program areas: Research and Advocacy, Training and Capacity Building, and Support to Development Projects and Programs, CommGAP is demonstrating the power of communication in promoting good and accountable governance and hence better development results (The World Bank Group).

friends, social leaders, peers and the community, at large, adopt the innovation. If it is something the individual feels confident in doing – referred to as self-efficacy – that does not conflict with that individual's deeply held values, they join one of the adoption groups. Finally, adoption of the innovation reaches a critical mass.” (Rogers, 2003 [1962]) The masses are us, the people, and the culture.

To start with, it would be desirable to define what “culture” actually means. Raymond Williams defines culture as ordinary. It is ordinary in a sense that it is a natural process that people are part of everyday. Every person makes culture by their own lives in connection with lives of the others. He says: “Every human society has its own shape, its own purposes, and its own meanings. Every human society expresses these, in institutions, and its arts and learning. The making of a society is the finding of common meanings and directions, and its growth is an active debate and amendment under pressures of experience, contact, and discovery, writing themselves into the land.” (1958, 93)

An anthropological perspective of culture, using words of John H. Bodley, defines culture from different points of view. The first perspective is topical, which says that “culture consists of everything on a list of topics, or categories, such as social organization, religion, or economy.” (1997)

A historical perspective speaks about culture as “social heritage, or tradition, that is passed on to future generations.” (1997) Behaviorists sees it as “shared, learned human behavior, a way of life.” (1997) Normative perspective defines culture as “ideals, values, or rules for living.” (1997) Functional point of view approaches culture as “the way humans solve problems of adapting to the environment or living together.” (1997) Mental perspective considers culture “a complex of ideas, or learned habits that inhibit impulses and distinguish people

from animals.” (1997) Structural definition of culture claims that “culture consists of patterned and interrelated ideas, symbols, or behaviors” (1997) and symbolists think that “culture is based on arbitrarily assigned meanings that are shared by a society.” (1997)

In 1777, Thomas Jefferson drafted *A Bill for Establishing Religious Freedom*, in which he indicates the fact that people are prone to believe and think what they are offered or rather shown to. “Well aware that the opinions and belief of men depend not on their own will, but follow involuntarily the evidence proposed to their minds.” (First Freedom Center 2013) At Jefferson’s time there were no current media such as television, the Internet or the telephone, but there were others, e.g. newspapers, public debates or advertisements to substitute such a role. One can say that media has always worked through culture and used its particular aspects, e.g., ideas, beliefs, ceremonies, language and many others to affect people.

At the beginning, the media served as a tool to inform people all over the world, especially the poor ones who did not know a foreign language (Latin). It was desirable for the growth of society to make them literate and teach them to read. With time, more and more people became literate and mass media started to fulfill another function – make people believe what was desirable for state institutions and the government itself. Nowadays, this model of the government and its target to manipulate the masses is primarily seen in the East – in the socialist and communist countries such as North Korea, China, Russia, Laos, Vietnam, etc. The western countries have been associated with mass media in a different way.

Money, business, fame, comfort and many other effects are prone to relate to culture; therefore, Kurt and Gladys Lang talk about mass culture and its birth connected with commercialism and business: “Mass culture has come into wide use

as a term deprecating the value of commercially marketed arts and entertainment packaged to appeal to people in particular demographic categories. Media managers are inclined to perceive their audiences as a statistical mass, paying little attention to people's vital needs or capacities for development.” (2012, 1014)

They also note in their book *Mass Society, Mass Culture, and Mass Communication: The Meaning of Mass* two features of a mass culture which makes it characteristic:

The one characteristic of mass culture just about everyone should be able to agree upon is its lack of roots in a hallowed local tradition. It is not an expression of people's everyday life, certainly not in the same way that folk culture is. Instead, the content--[sic] the creations, artifacts, and performances that constitute mass culture--[sic] is received from somewhere else. A second feature, a consequence of the decline in aristocratic and older forms of state patronage, is the pressure on the creators and distributors of these contents to find or build audiences sufficient for economic viability. To maximize appeal, productions are suffused with marketing stratagems. These include packaging, sensationalism, cross-media promotion, a star system, going after records, offering prizes, novelty, and rapid obsolescence. There is a premium on being the “latest” and most up-to-date. (Lang 2012, 1016)

The previous paragraph states that mass culture has no roots in culture itself. In contrast with this statement, Dwight McDonald connects mass culture with the “folk culture” to some degree and says that “it is to some extent a continuation of the old Folk Art which until the Industrial Revolution was the culture of the common people, but here, too, the differences are more striking than the similarities. The main

difference is that folk culture grew from below, but the mass culture from above. It was connected with technicians, businessmen, etc.” (Rosenberg 1957, 60)

McDonald actually repeats what Lang said in different words. In his opinion, mass culture is created from above, which means that people are simply driven by it and do not anticipate or influence it to a great degree.

Leo Bogart comes with another function of media culture in his book called *Commercial Culture: The Media System and the Public Interest*. He reflects on American culture and its interconnection with media, how media works through the culture but also how the culture spreads its beliefs and values without any help via media. “Media are sustained by the publicity and promotion they provide each other. Common symbols images and standards, common authority figures, a common cast of universally familiar characters are shared not only throughout a variety of media forms, but also among the various regions and social classes of American society. The effect is to homogenize national values.” (1995, 35)

With spread of globalisation, this might lead to a brand new perspective and function of media – to unify the diverse masses all around the world and to homogenize the world values. Daniel Lerner makes a relevant comment about media and its interdependence among people and function of unifying nations: “Media exposure develops a capacity for empathy, without which participation in the thought life of a geographically extended society would be severely limited.” (Lang 2012, 1000)

Simply stated, mass culture is not actually what culture brought and created itself but what is brought to culture through marketing or business. It is not intrinsic for the people, but superficial. The quality of culture, its skills and products do not

play much of a significant role. What is on the spotlight is how the mass culture works.

McDonald says that “mass culture is sometimes called popular culture, but he thinks that mass culture is more accurate term, since its distinctive mark is that it is solely and directly an article for mass consumption, like chewing gum.” (Rosenberg 1957, 59)

Nevertheless, with time, the term “mass culture” faded or was rather strongly marked by a negative feeling (as it was shown in previous paragraphs) and a new term substituted it and began to appear, “popular culture.”

Dick Hebdige claims that popular culture is “a set of generally available artifacts: films, records, clothes, TV programs, modes of transport, etc.” (Parker 2011, 149) In Bennett and Storey’s quantitative definition, “popular culture is simply culture which is widely favoured or well liked by many people.” (Parker 2011, 150) The last definition, the one regarded as a modern one, describes popular culture as a culture which:

Consists of the productions of those without cultural capital, of those without access to the approved means of symbolic and cultural production. That is, popular culture does not require the long training and apprenticeships of embodied cultural capital (The Ramones inspired The Clash because of their lack of training), nor the investment in acquiring objectified cultural capital (all you need is a guitar, or a voice); most importantly it stands explicitly outside the blessing of institutionalized capital (music conservatories, master classes). This formulation can be broadened to include both production and consumption. (Parker 2011, 161)

As the reaction to the negative connotation of mass culture, all these definitions present popular culture as the one which is favoured by people and does not cause any harm.

Dwight McDonald does not connect our Western culture only with mass culture or popular culture, but he considers it “high culture”, as well. He describes it as “the one chronicled in the textbooks.” (Rosenberg 1957, 59) The best of the best that has been chosen and presented to next generations as the values, artifacts or thinking which is worth preserving. The term was used for the first time by Mathew Arnold in his book *Culture and Anarchy* published in 1869. Arnold lived in Victorian England, which was at its cultural peak during that time. He spoke of it as follows: “It seeks to do away with classes; to make the best that has been thought and known in the world current everywhere; to make all men live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light, where they may use ideas, as it uses them itself, freely, nourished and not bound by them.” (1932, 70) The term is rather in contrast with the two previous ones, because Arnold saw the culture as a force for improving people’s lives, to strengthen the good moral and political values. Low culture; on the other hand, was already a term used in Ancient Greek (as well as high culture, but were not defined as such) for drama, literature or songs which did not have as much uplifting effects as those regarded as high culture. Low culture; in other words, was not regarded as the tool to enrich people with deeper values.

In addition, mass culture erases the boundary between low and high culture and is performed to anyone regardless the effect. It makes the society homogenized as McDonald says: “It is a dynamic, revolutionary force, breaking down the old barriers of class, tradition, taste, and dissolving all cultural distinctions. It mixes and scrambles everything together.” (Rosenberg 1957, 61)

Moreover, mass culture has made an adverse effect through its impact. It is not clear anymore, what should be considered high or low, since everything is performed in order to influence. It is not obvious as to what should be morally uplifting and good for the society. The only target is to gain as many people as possible and to possess their thinking. Moreover, they are getting used to accepting what is shown to them, disregarding if it is good or bad. Gresham's Law seems to be implicated here: "Bad stuff drives out the good, since it is more easily understood and enjoyed." (Rosenberg 1957, 62)

To finish, there are many terms with which our culture is connected. We can still hear that our culture is associated with mass culture, popular culture or high and low culture. It may be that one would get lost in all these terms, or simply not pay attention to them. However, it is critical to know the role of media in culture; consequently, what is our role and how is that role defined by the media. All of these play slightly different roles in relation to people and the effects they have on them. Mass culture is to "sell" as much as possible. Business and commercialism is the force behind influencing people's minds. Popular culture was; therefore, the reaction to the negative term of mass culture, which demonstrates that media plays quite a positive role in people's lives and does not always have harmful effects. Popular culture seems rather a new label, but it is the same old product, indeed, with only some added values. The values are said to be acting in the interest of good and people ought to buy them in order to see how good they are. High and low culture are associated with their relation to mass culture and the disappearance of the clear distinction between what is regarded as good and bad. All that is presented is presented with the intention of addressing as many people as possible; even though it might be worthless or useless.

2.1 Documentary Film as a Mass Medium

Mass media has a significant role all around the globe, presenting issues swinging between real and realistic. In the previous chapter it was showed how culture is connected with media and how they intervene between each other. Media; however, is a very general term that includes the cinema, the television, the radio, etc. Drew Davidson distinguishes between media and their genres. He compares them to means and manners which are two of three ways – object, manner, means – of representation by Aristotle.⁶

Davidson claims that “The means of literature is language. Words are the materials, but the manner of using these words can be different – poetry, short story, essay, etc. The subtle difference between means and manner is the distinction between medium and genre. The choice of a medium calls for another choice to be made as well: what form, or genre, to use.” (2012) He considers media as “a process using specific techniques and materials through which communication occurs. For example, painting is a medium; so is film, print, etc.” (2012)

As McLuhan says, “The medium is the message.” (Giles 2003, 6 – 7) Any message may be presented in a particular way, but is not always the same message. The particular way in which it is presented may be, in other words, the genre. Genre and medium are closely linked. Davidson describes genre as “a type or category of composition within a medium. So, the medium of discursive text is filled with genres: poetry, short story, fiction, non-fiction, novels, essays, etc.” Film as a medium has several categories such as “documentaries, dramas, action-adventure,

⁶ Aristotle describes in *Poetics* how representation of certain artistic products especially tragedy, but also lyric, epic, comedy and prose differs depending on what kind of a genre - object, manner or means - is chosen. Object of Representation stands for people. Aristotle speaks about people who are better than us, worse than us, like us, or like all people in general. Manner of Representation means whether the product is performed by use of narration, dramatization or the combination of both. Typical means of Representation are melody, rhythm and words. (Butcher 2000)

comedies, etc.” (2012) Genre, amongst other topics, is a thing that one discusses when sharing his or her experiences of a particular film. One discusses whether they liked the adventure, the camera, the shots, the emotions. Simply said, they summarize whether their expectations based on the genre were fulfilled or not.

Documentary film as a film genre and a tool of mass culture has shaped society since its beginnings. To understand its importance, one has to go back in history and start from the very beginning.

“A starting point in talking about moving images might be the development of technical evolution with special emphasis on photography and photographic art. The whole process from the photography to the first moving pictures was long and accompanied with a lot of inventions such as camera obscura (dark chamber), properties of silver salts leading to finding out the photonegative, magnetoptic effects, zoetrope (a wheel of life) – a turning cylinder that stimulated action, etc.” (Cristian and Dragon 2008, 3 - 5)

Documentary film has its origins in the invention of photography. Throughout the centuries it developed into an elaborated system of techniques and tools. Firstly, documentary film was not intended to be made as such. Only human curiosity was there from the outset. The beginnings were bound to authenticity, which was the driving power. “Such an example was the first films by August and Louise Lumière which were made at the end of the nineteenth century. These films called *Workers Leaving the Lumière Factory*, *Arrival of a Train*, *The Sprinkle Sprinkled* or *Feeding the Baby* from 1895 seem just a small step from the documentary films as such.”⁷ (Nichols 2010, 137) Even though these films are not considered real documentaries,

⁷ Díky výraznému dojmu autenticity se filmy Augusta a Louise Lumiérů natočené na konci devatenáctého století, mezi něž patří *Odchod z továrny* (*La Sortie des usines*), *Příjezd vlaku* (*Arrivée d'un train*), *Pokropený kropicč* (*L'Arroseur arrosé*), *Krmení dítěte* (*Repas de bébé*), zdají jen krůček vzdálený od opravdového dokumentárního filmu. (translated by the author of the Master's thesis)

but rather their fragments, and their time-duration is from tens of seconds to a few minutes, they influenced society a great deal, at that time. It was the first time people could see such things. They could imagine what the life of workers was like, or see people in their settings feeding their baby. For illustration, the short shot *Arrival of a Train* was so authentic for people at that time, that they started to run away from the cinema in order to save their lives and not to get hit by the train. One of the eminent French critics André Bazin thought highly of the work of the Lumière brothers at that time, and their films were generally considered “a sole capturing of an everyday life as it really was.”⁸ (Nichols 2010, 138)

Of course one has to take the period of the nineteenth century into consideration. It was a time in which inventions, machines and industry appeared in huge numbers. People did not see any of these before, so everything new was accepted either with optimism or skepticism, depending on the invention itself. It might be important to say that the Lumière brothers' films were one of the first moving pictures people had ever seen; therefore, they were fascinated. This made the effect on people even stronger; however, the message of the films was clear – to show people reality as the brothers saw, from their points of view.

Showing the events in great detail and as close as to how the creators saw it was the main focus of the beginnings of the genre. However, the performers did not behave naturally as they would when not being recorded. Rather, they were directed how to behave, when and where and generally what to do. Showing the conditions using as many similar aspects as possible was, however, misleading. “Documentary film usually challenges us to trust that what we see is what has been actually there.”⁹

⁸ ... díky zachování oné „důvěry v obraz“, které si tak cenil významný francouzský kritik André Bazin, vzbuzují filmy bratří Lumiérů dojem, že zaznamenávají každodenní život v té podobě, jaký skutečně byl. (translated by the author of the Master's thesis)

⁹ Dokumentární film nás obvykle vyzývá, abychom důvěřovali tomu, že to „co vidíte, je to, co tam bylo.“ (translated by the author of the Master's thesis)

(Nichols 2010, 141) The documentary genre illustrates the events, but it always includes personal opinions of the creators. That is to say, from the very beginnings the documentary film implied a certain level of subjectivity as it was seen at Lumière brothers.

Siegfried Kracauer puts the films of Lumière brothers into the category of the realistic tendency in cinema. The other category is the formative one. The first tendency shows the realistic representation of the world around us. People believe that what they actually see really happened. Therefore, the films of the brothers can be regarded a prototype of the documentary films. The formative tendency highlights the artistic and creative attitude in the creation of the films; thus, is rather focused on making an illusion in film. (Cristian and Dragon 2008, 13)

With time, the documentary genre made some progress. It was modified and changed. Authenticity was one of the two main “streams” at the beginning of the genre. The second stream was called “a cinema of attractions” by the film historian Tom Gunning. (Nichols 2010, 142) This was focused on the audience themselves. It showed shocking and extraordinary habits, traditions, parades, carnivals, etc., of countries all over the world. The main reason was to make people interested in or curious about the events. So the authenticity was slightly fading and what were chosen to be projected were the most captivating examples. The authors were focused on how the film could be more attractive and more interesting for the viewers. To link this stream with today’s world of documentary films, it has not disappeared. It has simply transformed into a way of presenting things in the most intriguing manner.

The prospect of authenticity was not only disrupted by the choice of topics and pictures selected by the author, but developments and inventions in the beginnings

had also their side effects, deceiving the viewer. They made a lot of things easier and achievable; on the other hand, they created some space for showing what an author was not able to show before. Either what was not even present in reality or what he had wished to show. When looking at the beginnings of the inventions, the deceiving techniques worked very well. “During the 1830s, following the pragmatic achievements of Michael Faraday’s magneto-optic effects (1831), Plateau created the *phenakistoscope* [deceiving the viewer]. The visual tool consisted of a disc which was divided into eight or sixteen segments, all with narrow window-like holes and a sequence of figures each in a given position of movement painted above the slit openings (Crary 109). The mechanism produced the illusion of movement when the viewer, who faced a mirror, turned the disc.” (Cristian and Dragon 2008, 5)

Twentieth century documentary films finally brought the filmmaker’s voice and indirectly his opinion into the film. The twenties and the thirties became the cardinal years of the documentary film as such. Four basic features which make documentaries a documentary were joined together and raised the genre to the top of an imaginary ranking.

The first feature was “an index documentary”. Charles S. Peirce came with the concept of “index” first. He said that “in the index the relationship is concrete, actual and usually of a sequential, causal kind. The pointing finger is a signifier whose relationship to its signified is indexical in mode. A knock on the door is an index of someone’s presence, and the sound of a car’s horn is a sign of the car’s presence in the same mode. Smoke is an index of fire. A weathercock is an index of the direction of the wind.” (Hawkes 2003, 105)

The documentary index was mainly used by Lumière brothers and presented the events as much as possible. The word “index” is used in order to show how precise

and authentic the documentary was. Nichols likens index and its physical connection with what it refers to: “finger print precisely copies the structure of lines of our finger pads, asymmetrical shape of a tree on a windy side reveals a prevailing wind strength and direction.”¹⁰ (2010, 140)

Another aspect was the so called “poetic experiment” which blended a film with various modernist and avant-garde features. Not only proofs but also presenting the filmmaker’s voice was significant. The creators tried to show their own point of view rather than just to prospect what the camera could have caught. (Nichols 2010, 144 – 145)

Another term was connected with the feature of the poetic experiment and this was “photogeny”. “Photogeny” expressed the ability of a film picture to offer something which supplemented or changed what was represented.”¹¹ (Nichols 2010, 146) In other words the advent of photogeny into documentary film opened the door to more experiments with camera and effects. When a camera caught the weary atmosphere of workers, it did not end with just this representation, but to strengthen the mood the filmmakers got a clear line of sight on a slow turning wheel of a mill, a tree lazily swinging in a mild wind or a cat lying on a window staring nowhere.

The third aspect which was undoubtedly connected with the documentary film was “a narrative structure of the story”. The narration was connected with the story; moreover, it made the story.

¹⁰ Index má fyzickou souvislost s tím, na co odkazuje: otisk prstu přesně kopíruje strukturu rýh polštářků našich prstů, asymetrický tvar stromu na větrné straně prozrazuje převládající sílu a směr větru. (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

¹¹ Pojem fotogenie vyjadřuje schopnost filmového obrazu nabídnout něco, co doplňuje nebo pozměňuje to, co je reprezentováno. (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

“The makers were forced to find a ‘voice’ which could help to represent the living world in another way than a spoken form. What they have found was integration of the voice into the film by editing, framing, music, lighting, etc.”¹² (Nichols 2010, 148)

The last feature was the “rhetoric”. The filmmaker’s own voice talking about what the people could see on the screen. The voice helped the genre be considered complete and a mainstream medium.

To be more precise, these four aspects were joined for the first time in the Soviet Union in the twenties. Up till now, the documentary film in some eastern countries has been considered a great tool of influencing the masses. “The value of the film can be used for the support of an active citizenship and to strengthen the government power position when confronting with the most burning topics of that time, such as inflation, poverty and great economic crisis. The voice of the documentary filmmakers became a significant tool to form a national program and common way of dealings.” (Nichols 2010, 157) In the western culture, the power is in the hands of those behind the business and commercialism.

As it is shown an intention to influence the public has been present since the outset of documentary film. Therefore, documentary film can be considered a mass medium which is made in order to change public opinion or reinforce it into a “more desirable” or “more majority” conviction.

¹² Možnost výběru hlediska přiměla tvůrce hledat hlas, jímž by se dal žitý svět reprezentovat jinak než mluvenou formou, a to včleněním do filmové tvorby (stříh, rámování, hudba, osvětlení a tak dále). (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

3 Truth, Half-truth or Falsehood?

At the very beginnings of human civilisation, there were people who seek the truth. They asked “what the truth was and how to find it.” The example of such people might be the first philosophers, for instance Socrates, Plato or Aristotle. Even at that time they already knew how important it was to know the truth and how it influenced the way of their thinking and understanding the world. In Ancient Greece they believed that there was one universal truth which had to be followed by everyone in order to live a good life. This universal truth was transformed to the idea of God in the Middle Ages. People believed that the only truth was God and everything from Him was true. The advent of the Renaissance put a person into the center and the era of Enlightenment claimed that the only truth was possible through the reason. With time, the twentieth century started to be overwhelmed by streams such as modernism and postmodernism. These new trends erased all what was considered traditional and brought new perspectives into art, literature, music etc. Postmodernism has brought one more aspect which has been shaping the society since and it is “plurality”. There is not only one truth, but several, and no one actually knows what the truth is. Jean-Francois Lyotard, a French thinker, writer and philosopher, who takes interest in postmodernism and its influence on people and on how they see reality defines the stream as following:

The postmodern would be that which, in the modern, puts forward the unrepresentable in presentation itself; that which denies itself the solace of good forms, the consensus of a taste which would make it possible to share collectively the nostalgia for the unattainable; that which searches for new presentations, not in order to enjoy them but in order to impart a stronger sense of the unrepresentable. A postmodern artist or writer is in the position of

a philosopher: the text he writes, the work he produces are not in principle governed by pre-established rules, and they cannot be judged according to a determining Judgment, by applying familiar categories to the text or to the work. Those rules and categories are what the work of art itself is looking for. The artist and the writer, then, are working without rules in order to formulate the rules of what will have been done. Hence the fact that work and text have the characters of an event; hence also, they always come too late for their author, or, what amounts to the same thing, their being put into work, their realization (*mise en oeuvre*) always begin too soon. Post modern would have to be understood according to the paradox of the future (post) anterior (modo). (Lyotard 1984, 85)

In this sense, it is much more demanding for one to recognize or say what is true. Everything seems to rely on our interpretations and thinking constructions. On the other hand, if one accepts such paradigm, it is impossible to believe anything. Everything can be looked at from various angles and perspectives. The concept of absolute truth slowly disappeared from our society and the way or manner in which it is presented makes it either veridical or not. From this point of view (the way of presenting issues), I would like to make a few notes about genre of the documentary film and its opposite docu-ganda film.

3.1 Documentary film

The development of the genre of the documentary was shown in Chapter Two as well as some of its features. Even at the birth of the genre itself, creators were dealing with a problem of authenticity, showing the audience their own points of

view on events or situations. The problem of the truth has been undoubtedly bound to this genre. It has become even more urgent issue in this era of diversity and variety of “truths”. It is for sure that there won’t be a film that is one hundred percent true, but what should be the target of all documentary genre makers is the choice of how to tell people the story and what techniques to use.

Since documentaries have climbed to the “spotlight” of the film industry, it has become urgent to put it under the scrutiny and distinguish representative techniques of the makers. Robert Lloyd supports such a claim in his article called “The Art of the Documentary; Truth, the Franchise; Michael Moore and Ken Burns: Opposites, soul mates. Yet like their medium, that just tells part of the story”. He asserts: “Reality, or its shadow, is everywhere these days. Where the documentary film was just a few decades ago a form practiced only by a few maverick, even avant-garde specialists, it is now --[sic] if you count television, in all its myriad channels --[sic] what accounts overwhelmingly for the bulk of filmmaking.” (2007)

There are more such writers who came to the same conclusion – that the genre of the documentary is one of the mainstreams and have risen. Jill Kipnis mentions such facts in her article about how the buyers demand more Documentary DVDs. It corresponds with what Robert Lloyd claims in his article. She notes:

Now, the genre is making big waves on DVD. “You didn’t use the ‘d’ word a few years ago if [documentaries] was the genre you were distributing,” says Steve Savage, co-founder of the Docurama label. “It has gone from being the ‘d’ word to the buzz word. 2004 will be much hotter than 2003. Our catalog and new titles are on fire.” Documentary DVDs are becoming hot commodities as a result of a booming special-interest DVD market and consumers’ heightened attention to reality-based programming in theaters and on TV,

industry executives say. The genre is also attracting more interest from major video distributors this year. Long a leader in documentary DVDs, Docurama is now. (2004)

The boom of the documentary puts much more pressure on the makers to create their films as good as possible, so the audience is not disappointed.

Without any doubt, it is difficult to make a straight line between what is true and what fictional. An article “Comment & Analysis: What a disaster: Documentary makers have a responsibility to inform, not overwhelm us with fiction-film razzmatazz,” written by Cherry Potter, is concerned with the responsibility of documentary film-makers to present people what they actually expect from such a genre – to tell the story as much truthfully as it happened. She says: “the boundary between fiction and documentary has always been blurred. The advent of post-modernism, with its assertion that all stories are forms of fiction and there is no such thing as a ‘true story,’ has reinforced this. But whatever one’s philosophical position on the truth about ‘truth’, the fact is that all film-makers, documentary or fiction, make choices about how to tell their story according to what they want to say and the audience or ‘commercial slot.’” (2003)

There are a lot of fictional stories which are exposed to people and about which people know they are not true. They approach such films with certain expectations, but they do not expect them to tell the facts or show how it was in reality. Documentary genre, on the other hand, “has a contract with the audience to tell a story based on researched facts and reportage. This is why, if dramatic reconstruction is used, it should be made clear to the viewer,” says Potter. (2003)

The bigger the progress in technique is, the more difficult it becomes to catch someone’s attention. Let’s just have a look at children these days. The Mole, Bolek

and Lolek or Mickey Mouse were “catchy” enough for us to spend hours and hours watching them, although we were ten years old or even more. Nowadays, children are so accustomed to colorful things making various sounds and movements and moving pictures with a lot of action. It has become usual for four-year-old children to watch cartoons such as *The Cars*, *The Toy Story* or *Monsters, Incorporated*. Not only children face such progress. Even we, adults, demand more. We also like electronics, lights, sounds, 3D-films, 3D-books, etc. So the commercial system is set to make the products in a way they catch our attention no matter what. This problem is not only on shoulders of the commercial makers, but all makers – food, clothes, shoes, books, magazines, films and even documentary makers. Potter does not blame the sum of documentary makers for the way they create their films, but sees the cause just in the pressure of modern society and its demand: “The ‘value’ driving most modern documentaries is whether they are gripping enough to keep the audience from changing channels. Documentary film-makers are under the same pressures as fiction film-makers – hence the compulsion to employ fiction techniques to captivate the audience, interspersed with as many ‘experts’ as possible, to reassure us that the film is in fact about ‘facts.’” (2003)

This is actually the biggest concern of the documentary makers, to keep the genre real and true, but still attract as much audience as possible. This binary relation can sometimes cause problems. They might choose to be authentic; nevertheless, it may happen it does not interest people enough, or they make it appealing, but they lack the element of the truth. Another possibility is they make it both captivating and true. One of such combinations is called “docu-ganda film” and seems to be appearing in the documentary genre more and more.

3.2 Docu-ganda film

There are not many definitions, so far, which would describe the term precisely. It might be due to the fact that such films started to appear just a few years ago and experts still try to find the best characterization of such phenomenon. However, it should be desirable to mention at least a few lines about the nature of docu-ganda films. *Urban dictionary* explains the term as “a film that uses documentary style to spread propaganda. Usually, docu-ganda will set out a premise and then attack any skeptics, rather than actually attempt to prove the case. The effect is that you either agree with the premise or you look like a fool.” (2013) It basically uses events, data, situations which actually happened, but shows them from such a perspective that when one does not believe it, they are considered they are wrong. It is made in such a persuasive way that one has to believe it. Daniel Wood is one of those who noticed the spread of docuganda films and points out their danger in his article called “In ‘Docu-ganda’ films, balance is not the objective”: “‘We need to clarify that this new wave of ‘documentaries’ are not, in fact, documentaries’, says Christopher Ian Bennett of New School Media [...]. ‘They fail to meet the Oxford Dictionary definition, in that they editorialize, and opine far too much. They are entertaining. But they can be dangerous if viewers take everything they are saying as the whole truth.’”(2006)

He also points out that one of the first pioneers of such films was Michael Moore himself. “The new, one-point-of-view documentary made its first commercially successful debut in 1989, when Michael Moore’s ‘Roger & Me’ explored the effects of General Motors Corp. on Flint, Mich. Since then, Mr. Moore has been turning out personal-viewpoint books and films that continue to produce accolades from liberals and clenched fists from conservatives.” (2006)

One can say that Daniel Wood belongs to the group of Christian thinkers and supporters of Republican parties' beliefs, because they have always had similar beliefs in comparison with Democratic parties. Thus, he will always consider George W. Bush's policy worth fighting for compared to left-wing supporter Michael Moore. The truth is that it is just one side of the coin. The other one is that a lot of Christians in America did not agree with the steps George W. Bush took and did not support him. Moreover, Wood mentions not only the films made by Michael Moore in his article but also "*Wal-Mart: The High Cost of Low Price, Sir! No Sir!* or, *Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room.*" (2006)

The authors of such films frankly acknowledge their films are different from usual documentary films. They do not deny that their films are in other words a kind of "biased." Robert Greenwald, director of *Wal-Mart* and 2004's *Outfoxed: Rupert Murdoch's War on Journalism*, says that "This is a revolution – that anyone can make a movie and spread the word about something they believe deeply in, and find an audience that cuts across politics." David Zeiger, director of *Sir! No Sir!* says that, "There is no such thing as objectivity. The idea of presenting one point of view that absolutely has to give equal time to another point of view is spurious. If you make a film with both sides, you are going to make a boring film. The [film] medium is not the same as journalism." (Wood 2006)

The concept of objectivity seems to be dealt with too much extent. One of such thinkers is a French philosopher, Louis Pierre Alhusser, who searches for the question of objectivity from a Marxist point of view. He claims that there is no objectivity. All is influenced by ideology. Ideology makes illusion of reality and one has to learn to interpret it.

However, while admitting that they (ideologies) do not correspond to reality, i.e. that they constitute an illusion, we admit that they do make allusion to reality, and that they need only be 'interpreted' to discover the reality of the world behind their imaginary representation of that world (ideology = illusion/allusion). [...] It is this relation which is at the centre of every ideological, i.e. imaginary, representation of the real world. It is this relation that contains the 'cause' which has to explain the imaginary distortion of the ideological representation of the real world. Or rather, to leave aside the language of causality it is necessary to advance the thesis that it is the imaginary nature of this relation which underlies all the imaginary distortion that we can observe (if we do not live in its truth) in all ideology. (1971)

Interpretation of what is shown to the audience is the most important feature to learn. Docu-ganda films have made an appearance in the film industry and one has to accept such a fact. Nevertheless, what one does not have to grant approval of is their content and the way in which makers present their opinions and points of view. These films may foster the audience to use their critical thinking, on the other hand, those who are not critical enough can be easily affected by the content, considering it true because documentary films ought to show the truth. Therefore these kinds of films should be labeled not documentary films, but rather docu-ganda films, so people approach them with certain doubts. The particular label should make them be more cautious and enable them to make their choice as to whether believe it or not.

3.3 Documentary Film – Reality; Docu-ganda Film – Realism

Documentary film, from Lumière brothers to the form we see today, has gone through the long history. The makers learnt how to use sound, light, voice, narration, distance of the camera, etc. However, the aim remained the same from the outset until present days, to show the event as it actually happened and make the picture as authentic as possible. Documentary makers (see Chapter 3.1) work with authenticity and present events and people as real as possible. Their main focus is to bring what they actually saw to people. It is, considered in advance that the transmission of the events into the documentary are not objective because of the human perception and a personal point of view. No matter the subjective matters, the aim remains the same. It is to present the event as reality and in reality, as it actually happened without any consciously used manipulating techniques.

Docu-ganda, on the other hand, has begun to appear just recently with the discovery the huge influence documentary films have on the audience. Docu-ganda makers create films which are also based on real people and events, but those are shown in a perspective with a very persuasive subtext. What is more, those who do not believe it or do not want to believe it are typically dismissed as too simple or down-to-earth to understand the film's arguments. Docu-ganda films are mainly created to persuade people to trust what is shown in the film and evoke strong feelings of liking towards the filmmaker. These films are connected with realism, not reality. Things which are presented might not be shown exactly as they occurred, but rather, they are exaggerated or underestimated in order to show an even worse or better reality.

As it was already said, it is rather impossible to present things as objectively as possible, and even less so in these days when everything is seen from various points

of view. Nevertheless, what makes the difference in presenting information is the choice of how people will be told the story and what techniques will be used. There are a lot of ways of showing what, how, where, when, and why something happened and what the consequences are. Thus, the chosen way makes the film either a documentary or a docu-ganda.

4 Fahrenheit 9/11

4.1 Fahrenheit 9/11: Content and Reviews

To show the way in which representation of an event and techniques used are important, I will focus on Michael Moore's *Fahrenheit 9/11*. It is a great example of a film where certain facts and real events are twisted and presented in a propagandistic way. In order to discuss this aspect, it is necessary to mention some information about the film and its content, so one can better know what will be under scrutiny in the following chapters. I have chosen to rely on information gained from *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Neither because it is the easiest way to gain it, nor because of its academic credibility, for which it is usually denied, but because it is the most neutral source I could find. The fact that the English edition of *Wikipedia* is edited by thousands of people from the whole range of the political spectrum, inside and outside the United States, makes it by definition more neutral than any other source compiled by a single person or a small collective of authors, albeit with the best intentions and the utmost care to be objective. Here is the complete content of the film described in my own words, but using some of the information and content structure from *Wikipedia*:

Michael Moore opens the film with a scene of Al Gore's winning in Florida. Afterwards he shows that it is not so and points at Fox News Channel and Bush's cousin working there. The channel, according to Moore, prematurely announced Bush the winner in Florida, thus it changed the progress of the 2000 election.

Then Moore reminds us the events of September 11, 2001. He shows Bush receiving the information about the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center,

portraying him as doing nothing, just sitting, thinking, and then continuing to read aloud to children in a kindergarten classroom.

Moore also analyzes the relationship between the Bush family and the Bin Laden's, their interest in oil and its whole impact on the US and Middle East policy. Moore alleges that the United States government evacuated 24 members of the bin Laden family on a secret flight shortly after the attacks, without subjecting them to any form of interrogation. He suggests that the Bush administration is not working for the best interests of Americans and tries to create a climate of fear approaching its climax in drafting *USA Patriot Act*. The film also focuses on the Iraq War, its nonsense and presents Lila Lipscomb who lost her son in the war. Moore ends the film by distributing registrations for the army among the members of Congress asking them if they were willing to send their own children to the war.

The film has been very controversial not only because of its content and the proofs which were used, but also because of its techniques and the way it has been shot. Many critics consider the film a documentary, but there are also those who cannot put it into any proper category. A selection of some of the reviews reflects the ambiguity of the film and people's attitudes towards it very poignantly.

A. O. Scott from *The New York Times* claims that "[...] it may be that the confusions trailing Mr. Moore's narrative are what make *Fahrenheit 9/11* an authentic and indispensable document of its time. The film can be seen as an effort to wrest clarity from shock, anger and dismay, and if parts of it seem rash, overstated or muddled, well, so has the national mood. If *Fahrenheit 9/11* consisted solely of talking heads and unflattering glimpses of public figures, it would be, depending on your politics, either a rousing call to arms or an irresponsible provocation, but it might not persuade you to re-examine your assumptions. But the

movie is much more than *Dude, Where's My Country*, carried out by other means. It is worth seeing, debating and thinking about, regardless of your political allegiances.” (2004)

The review considers the film an authentic documentary and anything which might be seen unclear or exaggerated is due to the whole confused climate of the country. The reviewer finds the film the kind which can broaden one's horizons no matter whether they are right-wing or left-wing. Scott sees the film as not usual and he thinks it is made in such a way that it might lead the audience to change their existing opinions. He does not mention the authenticity.

Peter Bradshaw from *The Guardian* comments the film as following: “On so much else, though, Moore incontestably scores points. We've become very used to cool, fence-sitting documentaries without a voiceover or riskily overt editorial content: the kind of film-making that prides itself on guiding the bull elegantly through the china-shop leaving the crockery undamaged. Michael Moore's inflammatory polemic is very different. It's certainly emotional and manipulative, brilliant and brazen. It won't get John Kerry into the White House on its own. But it lands a kidney punch on the complacency of the political classes.” (2004)

Peter Bradshaw points out that the film uses manipulative and emotional techniques to persuade the audience. At the same time he claims that there is nothing to be hidden. Nevertheless, these two comments do not make sense together. When something is manipulative, it is certainly done in a way that only a part of it is shown, or it is said in a way which is controlling so that the manipulation has its power. Either way, it always hides something. He sees its brilliance just in surmounting the typical barriers which documentary film has in order to keep its authenticity.

The same newspapers, but a different reviewer does not support the film. Mark Kermode from *The Guardian* says that the awareness of the political issues of Moore's is as weak as his proofs in the film. Moore, according to Kermode, makes rather satires of the documentaries which, however, are not even good and the finish product appears rather stupid. He does not recommend taking it seriously.

"Clearly, it wasn't designed to win my support, as the absence of all but one reference to Tony Blair's role in this debacle proves (Moore here seems even less interested in world politics than Bush). But on the level of satirical documentary film-making, *Fahrenheit 9/11* frequently falls so far short of journalistic adequacy as to become risible. If you want truly entertaining insights into the realities of American imperialism, check out Errol Morris's superb documentary, *The Fog of War*. As for Michael Moore, ask yourself this question: would you buy a used car from this man? Exactly." (2004)

Paul Clinton from *CNN* reviews the film like this: "Documentarians always have their own points of view, but Moore takes his positions and then guards them with pitbull-like intensity (though with humor as well). That tendency was plain in such past efforts as *Roger and Me* and the Academy Award-winning *Bowling For Columbine*. *Fahrenheit 9/11* takes his burning passion to new heights; the heat is downright tangible. But the question isn't whether *Fahrenheit 9/11* is a fair and balanced look at its subject matter. Of course it isn't. Rather, is it good filmmaking? The answer is yes." (2004)

Clinton appreciates Moore's intensity to fight for his opinions and truths with such an ease and humour. He regards Moore's passion for the issues very real and touching. However, using his own words, he admits that the film is not fair and

objective, but it does not matter in the end, because the way it is made is good and funny.

The last review is written by Chris Monroe from *Christian Spotlight on Entertainment* who speaks about Michael Moore and his film in a negative way: “Moore presents the information at a pretty rapid pace and doesn’t really allow the audience time to think them over. He uses facts, but also exaggerates them, and relies heavily on conjecture. If you already agree with his ideas, then it will clearly be entertaining and affirming. If you don’t know the details already, don’t expect an objective presentation from his spin on them. This film is presented entertainingly, but more than anything incites animosity and contempt for our President.” (2004)

Monroe does not support the film and considers Moore to have made the film with the main purpose of denigrating the president. Moore does not allow the audience to think deeply about the issues and moves rather quickly to another one. She also means that Moore leads the audience to a guess about something based on how it seems, not on proof.

It is also of relevance that *Fahrenheit 9/11* won a lot of awards (such as *ASCAP Award* by ASCAP Film and Television Music Awards, *Critics Choice Award* by Broadcast Film Critics Association Awards, *Palme d’Or Award* by Cannes Film Festival) (IMDb), which is rather unusual for a film which regards itself a documentary. Yet, there is possibly even more controversy because of the very label “documentary”: No film with so much doubtful evidence would normally hold awards in the category of “Documentary Film.” Documentaries are not necessarily always completely neutral and objective, but they are also not supposed to be propaganda of certain assumptions, which *Fahrenheit 9/11* seems to be, as it is to be shown below.

5 Propaganda Techniques Used in *Fahrenheit 9/11*

Fahrenheit 9/11 uses various methods and pieces of information to create credibility. However, when looking at these techniques more carefully, they can be found to be rather weak, manipulating and sometimes only half-true, or even outright fabrications. As it will be shown, in Michael Moore's world, the political spectrum is polarized into a harsh picture of the good and the bad. The Democratic Party is portrayed in the best possible light, whereas he presents Republicans as those who cheat the citizens of the country. *Fahrenheit 9/11* seems to be an effective weapon in such a fight using various propagandistic skills. The following chapters, however, try to prove that due to its deficiencies the weapon is rather self-destructive than truly efficient.

One of the definitions of propaganda is that "propaganda is viewed as a form of coercion without the appearance of coercion: its purpose is 'the deliberate and systematic attempt to shape perceptions, manipulate cognitions and direct behaviour to achieve a response that furthers the desired intent of the propagandist'. And it has become at various points in history more than a mere tool of governing, one of a number of instruments; it has become the medium which governing inhabits." (O'Shaughnessy 2010, 29) Another definition which seems even more suitable for our analysis of the political pressure is that "propaganda is a means by which a communicator can move audiences toward political and social action." (Simpson 2008, 103)

In the analysis, first, I will focus on a few techniques which were used to influence and manipulate people's opinions and in the second part I will deal with some factual information presented in the film, but either not shown in its entirety or shown as untrue. That is to say, through a careful analysis of the film's manipulatory

techniques I will prove that Michael Moore's *Fahrenheit 9/11* should not be labeled "documentary", but rather "docu-ganda."

5.1 Celebrities Endorsement

It is generally known that people often identify themselves with other people in order to find their own way of life. They have such a need from their early childhood. Children feel admiration for their parents, learn their hobbies, style of music, etc., and as they grow up, they start to identify themselves with the peers or with famous people. Anything that the idol does, or thinks, automatically catches the attention of the teenagers. When one gets older, it does not mean that the need for identification disappears.

To support such a claim that a person forms their identity throughout the whole life, I would use a theory of a German-born American developmental psychologist and psychoanalyst.

Erikson offered his psychosocial theory wherein each stage of life is driven by a crisis. When all of the crises are resolved in concert, healthy ego identity is achieved. A recent addition to this theory suggested that all the stages of adulthood are involved in the development of identity and that intimacy, generativity, and integrity are subcategories of identity. [...] An adolescent in the midst of identity crisis looks for models to emulate. Particularly for adolescents who don't have models in the home, the media provide a wealth of celebrities who fit as role models for just about any identity desired. Whether the young person is into rebellion, social activism, or philanthropy, potential models abound. (Stever 2011, 2)

Therefore, a lot of companies specializing in commercials and advertisements use famous faces in order to make people buy their products.

It is generally known that celebrities are often used for such activities; thus, they are often connected with commercialism. Magdalena Bekk and Matthias Spörrle (2010) claim that “[t]he influence of celebrities as endorsers of a brand on consumer attitudes is of particular interest to both practitioners [...] and researchers [...] alike. In general, endorsers are people who promote products of brands or companies. They can either be typical consumers of the products, experts or celebrities. As demonstrated by Atkin and Block the image of the brand is more positively evaluated and the advert is better remembered when using celebrity endorsers.” (54)

Commercial companies are aware of the huge impact which celebrities have on people. Moreover, “recent studies have shown the power of celebrities not only in terms of product selling but also for what concerns proposing ideas and developing social issue advertising [...], as well as political thoughts [...] and humanitarian issues” (Cortini 2010, 325)

Michael Moore seems to be aware of this fact, as well. At the very beginning of *Fahrenheit 9/11* there is a shot of the premature celebration of Al Gore’s victory in Florida. Al Gore was the rival candidate of George W. Bush in a presidential election in 2000. Ben Affleck (an actor), Robert de Niro (an actor) and Stevie Wonder (a musician) are shown standing in the crowd behind Al Gore’s back, applauding. Moore does not even forget to mention all these famous people and make a commentary, from which one can deduce that he wants to remind the public how great these people are, and that these great people support the Democratic Party. “Look, there’s Ben Affleck. He’s often in my dreams. And the *Taxi Driver* guy. He

was there, too. And little Stevie Wonder. He seemed so happy... like, like a miracle had taken place.” (2004, 00:00:30 – 00:00:43)

People who like these celebrities can either make sure that their favour of the people is right, that they share the same political opinions and support the Democrats, or they may start thinking about why these “great” celebrities are on the side of Al Gore’s instead of on the side of Bush’s. It may be the starting point of shaking the political opinions of those people which might have seemed stable up to that time.

One more celebrity who is shown in the film is Britney Spears (a pop singer). Moore chooses a shot in which the naïve young singer in her twenties believes faithfully in her president without any doubts. She says: “Honestly, I think we should just trust our president in every decision that he makes and we should just support that. And be faithful in what happens. Reporter: ‘Do you trust this president?’ ‘Yes, I do.’” (2004, 1:13:37 – 1:13:52)

In this case the choice of Britney Spears might go even further than it would seem. The story of the pop princess is generally known all around the world. In short, the life of a young, beautiful singer who appeared on the music scene and immediately became famous turned into horror when it showed that she was not as sane and pure as she claimed. Britney had always regarded herself a devoted Christian and a virgin. However, it showed that she had a few sexual affairs and also took drugs and drank much alcohol. George W. Bush regards himself also a devoted Christian and as Britney Spears he used to drink a lot of alcohol and is known to have taken drugs at college. Britney Spears who was loved by a lot of Americans was also the one who was cheating on them. It might evoke that this person who is

not worthy of trust was the supporter of George W. Bush; thus, it implies by association that the president himself might do the same.

The aspect of using famous faces is nothing unusual. A lot of companies and individuals use such tactics to draw the attention of as many people as possible. The companies simply use the feelings and the fondness of people towards the celebrities. “What makes an impression on the audience is the use of celebrities. There are a lot of commercials which buy celebrities’ faces, appearance, voices, hair in order to associate them with a particular product or service.”¹³ (Verner 2011, 176)

This, however, is a very emotionally persuasive tactic that does not belong to the repertoire of the documentary genre. Michael Moore’s film, rather than aiming at a portrayal of the events, simply uses celebrities to propagate and reinforce his opinions and persuade the public to believe the same thing as “their famous celebrities” do.

5.2 Contextualization

The human mind works on the basis of so called “structure activations”. Psychologists define the term as that:

People understand the world by relating what they are currently experiencing to the knowledge that they have previously accumulated. Much of this knowledge is thought to be organized into cognitive structures. [...] The influence of activated cognitive structures extends into every stage of information processing. The stimuli that are given attention, how those stimuli

¹³Velmi působivé je zaštiťování se celebritami, je mnoho reklam, které si kupují známé tváře, jejich vizáž, hlasy, vlasy, aby je spojily s nějakým výrobkem či službou. (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

are encoded, the organization and storage of those stimuli in memory, the retrieval and reconstruction of those stimuli, and judgments made after the retrieval of the information are all partially dependent on the structures activated at both the time of encoding and the time of retrieval. (Sedikides 1991, 169 - 170)

How people put the information together and make certain results is based, besides other things, on the organization of the stimuli. Contextualization works exactly on this assumption. Kelton Rhoades speaks of “contextualization” and its use in Michael Moore’s *Fahrenheit 9/11*. He says that “contextualization augments belief. Where omission takes away information, contextualization adds it. Contextualization is often used as a defensive tactic, but Moore uses it handily as playing offense, too. He’s particularly fond of juxtaposition, the placing (or forcing) together of discordant images or ideas, or interrupting an emotion and allowing it to leak over into another scene. Previous scenes set an emotional context for subsequent ones, even if the scenes themselves are unrelated.” (2004, 7)

The “magic of contextualization” is the point that not even the director, or people presented had ever said it is like this. Nevertheless, one might think it and connect it, even though in another situation one would never think of connecting those two things together.

The film is full of examples of contextualization; however, I will analyze only a few of them. At the 00:01:22 minute mark of the film, Moore presents that a cousin of Bush’s and his allies at Fox News channel announced Bush’s victory in Florida, even though results were not known, yet, everything indicated that Al Gore would be the winner. An unexpected sequence of events occurred: since Fox News channel broadcast the latest poll, almost all television channels began announcing Bush as the

winner in Florida and that influenced according to Moore the whole course of the election. Moore considers it one big fraud and manipulation. “In fact, [...] NBC called Florida for Gore at 7:49:40 p.m., Eastern Time. This was 10 minutes before polls closed in the Florida panhandle. Thirty seconds later, CBS called Florida for Gore. And at 7:52 p.m., *Fox* called Florida for Gore. Moore never lets the audience know that Fox was among the networks which made the error of calling Florida for Gore prematurely. Then at 8:02 p.m., ABC called Florida for Gore. Only ABC had waited until the Florida polls were closed.” (Kopel 2005)

After Moore says that the one in charge of Fox News channel is Bush’s relative and asks how one can live with such a fact, that the family helps them gain certain goals, there is a shot of Bush simply laughing and being happy. (2004, 00:01:54) By connecting and editing these two unrelated events, Moore creates an atmosphere of Bush having known all about the channel deception, but the only thing he really does is laughing about something unknown, completely unrelated to the scene used previously (i.e. broadcasting his Florida victory before the official results).

In the scene taking place after 34 minutes and 50 seconds of the film, Moore discusses the relationship between the Bush family and the Bin Laden family, and their long-term visits. He suddenly mentions American people who pay \$400,000 per year in taxes for a president of the United States and another group of people (there is a shot on Saudi people, the next example of contextualization) who invest \$1.4 billion in Bush. After the question; “Who you are gonna like?” there is a cut on George Bush senior shaking hands with Saudi politicians. The sequence of the shots is not arbitrary, but on purpose. It tries to make apparent that the Bush family tends to like the Saudis more because the Saudis invest more money in them.

Kelton Rhoads mentions another example of contextualization in the film. In this sequence it is obvious what the author wants everyone to think. “We know how dangerous it is to fly in a post 9/11 world – it is frightening. Then we see a clip of Bush, encouraging Americans to fly! Then another clip, with a dour expert telling us that it’s an exceedingly dangerous time to fly. (“Is Bush trying to kill all of us? Doesn’t he care about our safety at all?”) (2004, 7)

According to US Department of Transportation (2013) the total number of fatalities in the air in 2000 was 764, in 2001, there were 1166 casualties (mainly due to the terrorist attacks). In the following years, the numbers did not rise: In 2002 – 616 dead, in 2003 – 699 dead, in 2004 – 637 dead, in 2005 – 603 dead, etc. The numbers indicate that there was no rise in plane crashes since 2001; however, the fear of the people was on a psychological basis. In comparison with US highway fatalities, the numbers are significantly smaller. The number of people who died in car accidents in 2001 was 42,196; in 2002 – 43,005; 2003 – 42,884; 2004 – 42,836; and 2005 – 43,510; etc. Therefore, travelling by plane shows it is still one of the safest means of transport whether in 2001 or the following years.

The film also takes interest in *the USA Patriot Act*. “The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, shook the country’s sense of security. *The USA Patriot Act* gave the federal government new access to private information and records. The *USA Patriot Act* passed in the senate by a vote of ninety-eight to one.” (Panchyk 2008, 226) Moore relates particularly to the *Title IV* and *VII* of the document.

In *title IV*, the *Act* speaks about the protection of the Northern Border and ensuring the adequate personnel there. The personnel should be trained to do their best and acquire such facilities to support their work. When necessary the number of Border Patrol personnel and INS inspectors will be tripled. Fifty million dollars each,

to the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the United States Customs Service, was given for purposes of making improvements in technology for monitoring the Northern Border and acquiring additional equipment at the Northern Border.

Title *VII* of the *Act* promises increased information sharing for critical infrastructure protection. In other words, the information sharing system is said to be more effective and functional in order to address and prevent terrorist conspiracies and activities. (Congress of the USA 2001)

At the 1:04:37 minute mark of the film, Moore gets the audience familiar with the number of policemen and police officers who are on duty in Oregon. The total number is very small because of the budget cuts. Moreover, during a night shift there were only eight troopers in the whole state of Oregon on duty. As a result, Moore shows that the homeland security does not seem to be as good as it should be, Even though the Bush administration keeps claiming that the country is in a huge danger. What was obvious from these shots is that Moore tried to lead the audience to think that the real plan of George W. Bush was different. On the pretext of future terrorist attacks on the USA, Bush mobilized the army to go to war with Iraq. Moore does not say so directly, but the sequence of shots speaks for itself. There are those Oregon officers talking about an unprotected country and a ridiculous number of the officers employed, then there is a shot of Bush preparing for a television broadcast announcing the invasion of Iraq.

Bush is presented as a smiling and relaxed person who seems to have everything under control and even time to make funny faces. Afterwards there is a scene of Iraqi people, children riding bikes and playing with kites, a wedding ceremony, a funfair, and families together, people eating in a restaurant, etc.; simply

a causal day in the lives of the Iraqi. The atmosphere in Iraq evokes a quiet and peace like country, not a warlike one. Contextualization in this case makes the audience connect all that has been said before. The USA is not protected as it should be, even though the government highlights the danger of terrorist attack every day. Bush seems to be a person who is delighted by how it all works out; that Iraq can finally be attacked, following shots of Iraq, which does not seem to be dangerous at all. This all lead to the only possible conclusion, that George W. Bush has his own personal plans and wants to invade Iraq for everything, but dangerous terrorists.

I would borrow the last example of the contextualization from Kelton Rhoads again. Rhoads names a scene at the end of the film which is connected with a mother who lost her son in the war in Iraq. Firstly, the mother was very proud that a big part of her family including her son and a daughter serve in the army. When she is informed that her son has died, she appears to collapse and changes her mind about the war.

The scene happening at 1 hour 42 minutes and 50 seconds into the film, she says: “‘Why did you have to take him?’ Who is she asking – God? The enemy who took his life? In the immediately following clip, Moore shows us a stammering George W. Bush. Has Moore just called Bush a murderer? No, he didn’t say a thing. But we got the impression anyway.” (2005, 8)

Contextualization plays an important role in this film. As one could see from the examples of cutting, editing and timing, the director can create an illusion that even though the events or situations have nothing in common, they seem to do so.

5.3 Music

It is generally known that music is an essential part of any film, commercial or a television shot. When one plays a film without sound or music and then plays exactly the same film with the sound and music on, the effect will be completely different. Music enables the audience to experience scenes more deeply and perform the whole film in a particular mood. A lot of directors and filmmakers are aware of such a fact; thus, they choose such songs which evoke certain emotions. They work with music in their films in a way that they choose a particular shot of the film and a particular music and the result is that the combination plays a big role on people's perception of the shot. Even in early silent films, music played a significant role. "There was appropriate music for every type of film: hectic melodies for the chase, idyllic and melancholic tunes to love scenes and fateful moments, dramatic sounds for impending danger." (Cristian and Dragon 2008, 14)

According to Geoffrey Cox "comprehension in the filmic modes described by Beattie as examples of documentary display is sensuous and affective, produced by sound and sight (listening and looking), and operating through subjective rather than cognitive impressions and processes." (2011, 54) Consequently, music is a great tool and instrument to change people's feelings and evoke certain moods. The power of such a tool gets even bigger if used in combination with visuals. With this in mind, one is not surprised that music has also been used for propaganda. Commercial jingles, short rhymes or typical national songs share the same message and that is to make people remember them and connect them when needed. For example, national songs or anthems are sung in order to homogenize the society, make them proud of their country, or strengthen the awareness of either democratic or dictatorial authorities.

From stirring patriotic anthems to protest songs, music and lyrics are important propaganda techniques. Whether the exhilarating melodies and words of “La Marseillaise” or a commercial jingle advertising Tums, music is effective because it combines sound and language and is repeated until it becomes familiar. “Yankee Doodle Dandy,” sung in the American Revolutionary War, was an American adaptation of an English satire against themselves. Arlo Guthrie’s “Alice’s Restaurant,” written in 1968, was both a protest against an officious and petty village police department, as well the Viet Nam War draft. (Perris, 1985, 5)

Jowett and O’Donnell claim that “The national anthems played for the gold medal winners at the Olympic Games signify nationalist pride. The ‘Star Spangled Banner’ is sung at the opening of baseball and football games. Music is an effective propaganda technique because it touches the emotions easily, suggests associations and past experiences, invites us to sing along, and embraces ideology in the lyrics.” (2012, 304)

Michael Moore, however, does not use any slogans or national songs to manipulate the crowds, but what he definitely seems to be aware of, as any other director, is the effect which music has in combination with the picture. It is not a coincidental choice of the sounds or songs, but a very precise and smart option, which directs the whole picture and atmosphere of the film just where the filmmaker wishes.

Michael Moore uses a lot of music in *Fahrenheit 9/11*. For illustration, there are seven shots chosen at random which demonstrates how powerful a shot can be when the music played is not only the background music.

In the scene taking place after 7 minutes and 20 seconds, George W. Bush is shown as the one who has troubles getting his legislation passed and lost the Republican control of the Senate. It appeared that he was losing the favour of the public and anything he tried to do, did not end in success. Followed by an ironical comment there is a shot of George W. Bush spending his time on holiday, instead of trying to solve the problems. The whole scene is even more persuasive accompanied by a song performed by The Go-Go's called *Vacation*.

Another scene occurring at the 00:35:36 minute mark of the film when George Bush senior is shaking hands with the Saudi politicians. Moore tries to lead the audience to a conclusion that the Bush is more prone to have good relationships with the Saudis instead of the Americans because of money. Saudis, according to Moore, invest more money into the president than the whole American people. To make such a claim stronger and reassure the people that the reality is just like this, Moore uses the song *Shiny Happy People* by R.E.M.

The forty-fourth minute of the film offers a shot in which George W. Bush, Donald Rumsfeld, Dick Cheney and Tony Blair are presented as the actors starring in an old western film. The main set is in Afghanistan. They are presented like fearless American cowboys, who decided to restore order in Afghanistan and stop the injustice happening there. The music played is a theme song of *The Magnificent Seven* film.

Music evoking fear and anxiety appears at the 00:54:48 minute mark of the film. It attempts to show the politics of the Bush administration trying to make an atmosphere of fear and danger, in order to make the people to turn to their leader to protect them. Bush appears to be an initiator of the whole war because of his personal affairs in the East. Moore presents him as if he is trying to evoke the mood

of fear and danger so that people are willing to protect their country and go fighting. Then there is John Ashcroft (who served as the 79th U.S. Attorney General in the George W. Bush Administration during the war on terror) singing a song *Let the Eagle Soar* - “Let the eagle soar, Like she’s never soared before. From rocky coast to golden shore, Let the mighty eagle soar,” etc. In this respect, the whole shot suggests that George W. Bush, and his administration, are like a big eagle, spreading her wings and going to the East. The eagle soars and nothing can stop her.

The song *Fire Water Burn* performed by *Bloodhound Gang* makes its appearance at 1 hour 10 minutes and 53 seconds of the film. Moore indicates that American soldiers seem to be killing mostly civilians, based on what he shows the audience, and that the war is unnecessary. The soldiers go sometimes go mad from all that is happening around them. Moreover, to prepare themselves for the fights, soldiers listen to warlike music to feel no sympathy with the enemies, even with the civilians. The lyrics of one such song by Bloodhound Gang are: “The roof, the roof, the roof is on fire, The roof, the roof, the roof is on fire, The roof, the roof, the roof is on fire, We don’t need no water let the motherfucker burn, Burn motherfucker burn.” This combination tries to tell the audience that in the hunt for terrorists, Bush administration does not care about anything. Being guilty or not, when living in Iraq it means that anyone can be a potential terrorist, even the poor civilians. So soldiers trained to slay or to “remove” any person who might be a danger for them (including civilians), kill the enemies and listen to music with such lyrics.

At the 1:18:28 minute mark of the film, Moore says the government did not allow any cameras to shoot the coffins with dead soldiers coming from Iraq. He tries to show that this was not what the government, especially George W. Bush, was concerned about. They wanted to celebrate because the USA and the allies prevailed

in Iraq. Moore does not even mention or take into consideration that the photo ban was in effect the whole time, not only after the victory. Moore presents George W. Bush at the spotlight, not the dead soldiers, not even the living ones. He tries to demonstrate that the whole war and fight against terrorism, was mostly to celebrate the president of the USA. All of these were accompanied by the sounds of the song *The Theme from The Greatest American Hero (Believe It or Not)* by Joey Scarbury. The lyrics presented in the film are “Believe it or not, I’m walkin’ on air, I never thought I could feel so free, Flyin’ away on a wing and a prayer, Who could it be? Believe it or not it’s just me.”

The last example of the music appears in the scene at 1 hour 30 minutes and 22 seconds into the movie. The song is sung by Bing Crosby and The Andrews Sisters called *Santa Claus Is Coming to Town*. The scene takes place on Christmas Eve. Even though the soldiers would like to relax and enjoy this time of the year, they are in a combat zone and they cannot. They keep searching the houses of the civilians to find the targets (dangerous people supporting Al Qaida). In this shot, Moore combines two realities of life which cannot be combined; thus, showing the audience the ridiculousness of the whole situation. Christmas is generally known as the time of love and peace during which the whole family should be together and share the moments. In comparison with that time there is a war time and a combat zone which is far away from what can be called “peace” and “love.” Moore just simply seems to say that there should be no war because all people have right to be with their families. Thus, he strengthens the whole anti-war propaganda in the film.

Music is an important part of our everyday lives. We hear various tones and lyrics throughout a day and they evoke certain memories, feelings or mood. It is exactly the same mechanism, in addition with visuals, which works in the films. The

combination of the sound and the picture is a great tool in the hands of any director. Nevertheless, when used in order to push the audience into certain feelings and assumptions with almost no free will to make them decide, the tool becomes a dangerous weapon which can work on the analogy of a drug. A drug, which has an absolute power over the people and makes them feel only what it consists of, nothing more and nothing less.

5.4 Half – truths

Since one faces information overload, it might get challenging to distinguish between what the truth is and what just seems to be so. For the purpose of this thesis, I will use three categories to talk about truth: First, complete truth; second, half-truth; or third, a lie. However, as it was already mentioned in the previous chapters, living in a postmodern world brings a challenge to the concept of objectivity. In a postmodern mentality, there is no single and only truth. Nevertheless, I believe that it is still possible to distinguish between truths, even though viewed from various angles, and half-truths. Half-truth is defined by Merriam-Webster as “a statement that is only partially true and a statement that mingles truth and falsehood with deliberate intent to deceive.” What seems to be the most important in the definition is that half-truth is “deliberately intended to deceive.” Consequently, the one who uses only half the truth plans to cheat on those who receive the information. It is the intent to cheat others that makes what was at least a half truth, a lie. Using the words of Benjamin Franklin one could sum up that “half the truth is often a great lie.” (1758, 89)

In other words, rather than regarding such issues as objectivity, the plurality of opinions or the philosophical question “what the truth indeed is”, my discussion is focused on the intention of the information transmitter, their purpose and what they want to accomplish. From this perspective, I analyze two specific “facts” which were mentioned in *Fahrenheit 9/11* and which seem to fall into the category of a lie, because of revealing only half the truth.

5.4.1 The USA and Saudi Arabia Relationship

Besides other things mentioned in *Fahrenheit 9/11*, Michael Moore highlights the relationship between the Bushes and the family of Osama bin Laden and regards the relationship as special. He also speaks about Prince Bandar, Saudi ambassador to the USA, and his great influence on the U.S. government; the connection with the Carlyle group, an American-based global asset management firm, specializing in private equity; huge investments of the Saudis in the USA; and special protection of the Saudi embassy in the USA (he does not mention the fact that any embassy which asks for protection, will have the protection). Michael Moore, however, shows only the one side of the coin. The other side is that Saudi – American relationships are not an invention of the Bush administration, but have a long history dating back to 1930s. Moreover, as it is generally known the Bin Ladens belong to an important wealthy family living in Saudi Arabia and having close relations with the local royal family. The Bin Ladens play a significant part in the politics of their country; therefore, regarding foreign affairs, the family cannot be excluded or avoided. Consequently, the Bushes have known and made acquaintance with the Bin Ladens for a few years before their presidential periods due to their common interest in oil. Both families are very rich, have a long tradition and due to these facts they have

a significant influence in their countries. Therefore, it does not make the relationship special or mysterious, but rather, it illuminates the bond and likeness.

Upon entering office in January 2001, the administration of George W. Bush had inherited a largely neglected relationship between the two nations from the Clinton Administration; a relationship that steadily worsened as the fighting between Israelis and Palestinians provoked anti-American reaction in the Middle East. Yet Bush also brought to the presidency two other inheritances that initially seemed like potential mitigating factors. The first factor was the personal relationship between the Bush family and the Saudi royals, inherited from Clinton's predecessor and the new president's father, George H.W. Bush. This connection seemed to offer hope to Riyadh, for a renewal of the relationship through known channels. Like his father, the younger Bush was a former oilman, likely to grasp the importance of U.S.-Saudi relations. (Pollack 2002, 86)

What is; however, special is the whole relationship between these two countries. One cannot understand the engagement of these completely different regimes, but the truth is that the relationship has lasted for several decades. To support such a claim I would use the part of the article called "The U.S. and Saudi Arabia Since the 1930s" by David Ottaway:

There have been two constants in U.S.-Saudi relations for decades: oil and Gulf security, particularly the security of the Saudi royal family. Our two societies have had little in common, and yet despite deep differences, we have had a "special relationship" with the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia for over sixty years, really since the early 1930s, though it was not described as a special relationship until after WWII. The two countries have had a compact based on

Saudi oil in return for a U.S. security umbrella over the kingdom to protect it from all foreign foes. This is a relationship very definitely anchored in state interests, not common ideologies or political or social systems, which remain at extreme odds with each other. (2009)

Even though the countries do not share the same opinions on freedom, politics, religion, democracy, or a question of gender, they have a common bond, which is oil. Oil is one of the biggest materials that runs their economy and contributes to the national welfare. “For over 80 years the United States and the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia have enjoyed a strong relationship based on mutual respect and common interests. Diplomatic relations were established in 1933. That same year Standard Oil of California signed an oil concession agreement with Saudi Arabia. That initial partnership, of course, developed into the largest oil company in the world in terms of crude oil production and exports; Saudi Aramco.” (Smith 2013)

The bond was strengthened by the Bush and the Bin Laden families whose concern for oil industry made the relationship more intense. However, the oil is not what should be regarded a central point of Bush interest. According to BBC News there is a sufficient amount of oil in the USA: “The IEA (International Energy Agency) said it expected the US to overtake Russia as the world’s biggest gas producer by 2015 and to become ‘all but self-sufficient’ in its energy needs by about 2035. The rise in US production means the world’s reliance on oil from traditional oil producing countries in the Middle East, which make up Opec (the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries), would end soon, according to the report.” (2013) Even though the article dates back to 2013, which is not a year of Bush’s presidency, one can assume that when there is a lot of oil now and it is about to

become an even stronger exporter and producer, there was enough oil a couple of years ago.

On the other hand, Saudi Arabia still belongs to significant business partners of the USA and no government representative, or a president himself, can dare to threaten such a bond. There might be some incomprehension or a clash of values, but world countries cannot dare stop dealing with each other because of these. If each country would break their connections with the others because of disapproval of some of their treatment, there would be nothing like current world business, or world unifying organizations. To be more precise, I would mention an example of China. It is a Communist country which obviously represents a country of numerous violations of human rights, in particular violations of the right to liberty and security, the freedom from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, the right to an effective remedy, and, in extreme cases, the right to life. Nevertheless, the world countries are so dependent on its economy and low-cost labour that they cannot afford to harm their mutual relations. “According to the IMF, about half of the world’s economic growth this year will be accounted for by Brazil, Russia, India and China – the BRICs. India, staggeringly, is contributing more growth to the world economy than the United States, but China is by far the most powerful engine of growth – more so than the US, the Eurozone and Japan combined. [...]” (The Independent 2007)

To conclude, it is true that the Bush family has significant connections with the Bin Ladens, and that they cooperated on certain business affairs which dealt with their common oil interest. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that the relation of these countries was not the matter of the year 2000 onwards, but has a long history.

Even though the countries seem they cannot be further apart in their mentalities, the relationship has lasted for more than 80 years, and has a significant impact on their economies. Of course as with every relationship, this one also has had better times and worse times. The best characterization which describes the bond between these two countries can be found in a book by Eric Laurent called *The Bush Dynasty*:

“The oil is the main relation and bond between the USA and Saudi Arabia. The former claims itself the most democratic society in the world, the latter a theocratic monarchy, in which there is no free speech or any possibility of choosing political leaders through free elections. Robert Kaiser and David Ottaway expressed the relation aptly in *Washington Post*: ‘Each of the partners would be horrified if they try to impose their own values, belief and habits to one another’.”¹⁴ (2003, 90)

5.4.2 George W. Bush and Veterans

Since September 11, 2001, George W. Bush was determined to fight and find the terrorists which attacked the USA, and announced the War on Terror. “Sketching in the outline of an aggressive[sic] new American foreign policy, The Bush administration today gave the nations of the world a stark choice: stand with us against terrorism, deny safe heavens to terrorists or face the certain prospect of death and destruction.” (Raines 2002, 72) Including the war on terror and the wars before, such as World War II, Vietnam war or Gulf war, the consequences of these fights can be visible up till now. One of these is that there has been a significant number of war veterans there. “While only a fraction of a percent of the country’s population is

¹⁴ Ropa je tím hlavním vztahem a pojítkem mezi oběma zeměmi, z nichž první se otevřeně označuje za nejdemokratičtější společnost na světě a druhá za teokratickou monarchii, kde neexistuje ani svoboda slova ani možnost politické volby. Jak to píšou velice přesně Robert Kaiser a David Ottaway ve *Washington Post*: „Každý z těchto dvou partnerů by se zhroutil, kdyby mu ten druhý chtěl vnucovat své hodnoty, víru a zvyky.“ (translated by the author of the Master’s thesis)

currently serving, 7 percent of the population is veterans. There are 22,658,000 veterans in America today, just 8 percent of which are female.” (Martinez 2011) More than twenty-two million people have been, in some way, dependent on the government, its benefits for war heroes and on the program of veteran health care. The number can be compared to almost the whole state of Texas (population: 26,059,203 in 2012). It has not been an easy task for any president, and his administration, to take care of such a huge number of people, who fought for their country and now expected certain compensation. The tension between the government administration and its program and expectations of the veterans has been present for a long time.

Michael Moore presents this problematic issue in *Fahrenheit 9/11*, as well. To quote him exactly, he said of George W. Bush: “He proposed cutting combat soldiers’ pay by 33% and assistance to their families by 60%. He opposed giving veterans a billion dollars more in health care benefits and he supported closing veteran hospitals. He tried to double the prescription drug cost for veterans and opposed full benefits for part-time reserves.” (Moore 2004, 1:38:28 – 1:38:52) What Moore said is true, but he only showed the “unpopular” steps in policy towards war veterans. One cannot see all the expanses that need to be covered in order to keep the state budget in balance. The Republican Party is generally known as less pro-social, boosting people to take responsibility for their own lives and be less dependent on the government itself.

George W. Bush’s administration might have done certain cuts concerning the issues of veterans; on the other hand, they have provided a lot of other things which helped those former soldiers. From various newspaper articles, one can make

a different picture of such help towards veterans in comparison with Michael Moore's picture.

The New York Times revealed the steps of the Bush administration to raise drug prices for veterans, which is actually what Michael Moore said in *Fahrenheit 9/11*. However, what was not said, was the fact that the raise concerns mainly those veterans who had higher incomes: "President Bush's budget would more than double the co-payment charged to many veterans for prescription drugs and would require some to pay a new fee of \$250 a year for the privilege of using government health care, administration officials said Sunday. [...] The president would increase the co-payment for a month's supply of a prescription drug to \$15, from the current \$7. The administration says the co-payment and the \$250 'user fee' would apply mainly to veterans in lower-priority categories, who have higher incomes and do not have service-related disabilities." (Pear 2005) In another article by Ross Sherwood it is said that "[...] his VA officials floated a plan to limit new enrollments, the idea being to suspend medical care for 'better off' vets, those with incomes exceeding \$35,000 a year, a plan rebuffed by Congress." (2007)

President Bush also signed the so called *Hubbard Act* during his presidency. This Act has a certain connection with the film *Save Private Ryan* which takes place during World War II, and in which a young soldier Ryan is being searched for in order to get home to his family. Since his two brothers died in action, he is the only surviving child of the family and the aim of the army is to bring him home. This story was inspired by the true person Fritz Niland. In 2008 the same type circumstance happened to Jason Hubbard, whose two brothers died in Iraq, and he was sent home. However, as he did not fulfill his contract, he was not entitled to veteran's benefits and health insurance. Jason Hubbard, however, did not surrender

and following certain steps with the help of lawyers, he proposed the *Hubbard Act* which was passed by Congress in the same year. The content of the *Act* is the following:

To ensure the fair treatment of a member of the Armed Forces who is discharged from the Armed Forces, at the request of the member, pursuant to the Department of Defense policy permitting the early discharge of a member who is the only surviving child in a family in which the father or mother, or one or more siblings, served in the Armed Forces and, because of hazards incident to such service, was killed, died as a result of wounds, accident, or disease, is in a captured or missing in action status, or is permanently disabled, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the dollar limitation on contributions to funeral trusts, and for other purposes.

(Congress of the USA 2008)

It has been a long term problem which was not covered by any administration before. Soldiers who found themselves in such a situation did not have any benefits or veterans' advantages. It is true that Jason Hubbard was the first one to draw attention to such cases and Bush's administration had to face the problem. Which is what the former presidents' administrations did not have to. Not on purpose or planned, but still the Bush's administration was the first to pass the law which would protect such soldiers and their families. "President Bush signed *the Hubbard Act* into law, which forever secures the benefits of 'sole survivor' veterans who are honorably discharged after the death of a parent or sibling also serving in the military." (Military Hub 2011)

Although George W. Bush has ended his presidency, he keeps intervening in issues concerning veterans. The George W. Bush Institute, besides many other

activities, focuses on military service, particularly war veterans. One of the programs supporting former soldiers is called *Circles of Excellence*. It helps the individuals in six following areas: Jobs in the civilian workforce, Housing, Continuing education, Family services, Healthcare, Unique issues facing women service members. The Institute co-operates with other American institutions, for example, the Bank of America Charitable Foundation: “The Bank of America Charitable Foundation has partnered with the Bush Institute through a \$1m grant to help fund the Military Service Initiative. The partnership builds on Bank of America’s recent investment or \$22 million in funding to nonprofits offering job training, education and support services that help connect the unemployed, underemployed, veterans, youth, and those with disabilities with employment opportunities.” (George W. Bush Institute 2013)

President Bush did certain unpopular steps in the issues concerning veterans such as increasing prescription fees. As it showed, however, the increase concerned only those veterans with higher incomes. During his presidency, he signed the *Hubbard Act* which promises fair treatment to discharged soldiers due to their family responsibilities. He also keeps working in favour of the veterans and keeps financing or helping them by the means of his institute.

The coin always has two sides, just as the politics of any president. Michael Moore attempts to show the audience only one side and hides the other one, or pretends there is no other side. People are individuals, and so are their opinions. One can never please all, and decisions that are made will never be accepted by everybody. George W. Bush made certain decisions which were not wise; on the other hand, he also made those which proved good. It has always been considered fair to get to know all aspects of the issue so one can draw their own conclusion.

Michael Moore does not play fair. His strong words and one-sided opinions do not let people decide on their own.

Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to conduct a comparative analysis of the documentary genre and docu-ganda in a film made by Michael Moore called *Fahrenheit 9/11*. The film was analyzed in the context of the use of propagandistic and manipulative techniques which characterize docu-gandas. The techniques are used in order to persuade and press people to believe what is presented in the film. This pressure works through persuading the viewer that if they do not believe it, or have some doubts, they feel unintelligent.

The first part of the analysis dealt with the issue of media and their influence, both positive and negative, on society nowadays. The main purpose was to highlight how it is getting more and more important in these days to distinguish which piece of information is trustworthy, and which is not, and how media shapes our opinions and points of view. Media does not bring people reality. They create surroundings which look real, but in its essence are not. Realism is what is being created so that the society hears or sees events which actually happened, but the picture of the events is distorted, and presented in a certain way. Francis Bacon once said that knowledge is power (Simpson 2003), which still true, but this claim could be further adapted to the present by saying “knowledge and media are power.”

The question of culture is undoubtedly connected with media, because one works through another. That is why it is desirable to realize that mass media partly creates the culture, creates the surroundings we live in, and we should learn how to not only ‘survive’, but live in such a world. Culture is actually all that humans create starting from clothes, books, hair style to marriage, funerals or the way of raising children. To understand culture more, people started to add words which characterize

the culture such as mass, popular or high and low. In all these cultures media plays a different role; and so do we. Mass culture is typical for its use of mass media to sell products and focus on business. Media is used, or misused to bomb the public with as many commercials, advertisements, slogans or fliers as possible. They do this in order to catch public attention and present the goods as the best of the best. People can either accept it, hitching a ride on this business wave, or try to learn how to read between the lines and not to be caught by the techniques so easily. Popular culture speaks about the positive effect of media on people. It is entertainment and fun that people can find in and through media, as well as the ease with which they can get information. High and low culture is not so much talked about these days as it used to be when society was divided into the aristocracy, with those who were noble in their origin or thinking, and those who were poor or considered not so exalted. This boundary has been fading away and what was considered low might be considered high and vice versa. In order to gain the interest of the public, mass media uses anything, low or high. As people living in a mass media society, we should learn to work with our role and our possibilities and be aware of the fact that the relation between us and culture is not one sided, but mutual. Media creates us, the culture, but the culture creates the look of the media.

Since mass media has a significant role in shaping the society, it was desirable to mention what kind of a mass medium documentary film is. The history of this genre dates back to the invention of photography which was about to capture the reality. Authenticity was the driving power of the makers and they tried to present what they saw. The Lumière brothers are considered to be the first ones who succeeded in creating a film, and illustrating the real life of everyday things such as the arrival of a train, feeding a baby or leaving a factory.

However, the point of view of any person is already subjective, because no two people see and perceive things exactly the same. Thus the issue of subjectivity accompanied the genre from the very beginning up till now. Moreover, the genre naturally started to branch into different areas. The first one was the sole, real and authentic; and the second one was the so called cinema of attractions, in which the makers were searching for topics or events that would catch the attention of the people more than any other topics. With time the documentary genre got its characteristic form which is made up of four main features. The first is index documentary, which means that real objects are connected with what really happened and what they signify, e.g. smoke and fire, snow and cold, etc. The second one is so called poetic experiment, with modernist and avant-garde features. Makers started to work with effects of cameras and visuals, in order not to lie, but present the reality even stronger. The third feature deals with narration through music, scene cuts, editions, and the last characteristic is the filmmaker's voice.

The documentary genre was made with the intention of showing the public events which really happened, and which could help people broaden their horizons and their view of reality. In this way it is a tool which can have a significant power and influence on the masses. Docu-ganda, on the other hand, has appeared just recently and it combines the features of the documentary genre and propaganda. It does not have a long history, but it definitely might go down in history as we can see with the film *Fahrenheit 9/11*.

As it was said at the beginning of the paper, the aim was to prove that Michael Moore did not make a documentary film with *Fahrenheit 9/11*, but a docu-ganda. He used dubious techniques, such as the faces of famous people in order to make his views even stronger. He misused the ability of the human brain to connect two

consecutive events, even though they have nothing in common, to reach a conclusion. He cut, edited and lined the shots in a way that people would believe the events happened just as presented.

Moore also used a particular sound track to evoke certain feelings and emotions, which is a common tool of every filmmaker. The message of the music chosen by Moore, however, does not allow the public to have their own opinion, but persuades them to adopt the filmmaker's. In addition, his choice of music appears rather strange, because the songs are used so simply and obviously that a critical viewer has no doubts about what he is trying to say.

Half-truths are a huge tool of propaganda, because they can easily camouflage people telling lies. In general, the working mechanism is very simple. Half of what is said is true and the other half, not suitable for what is at stake, is not said. This issue was analyzed in connection with the USA and Saudi relationship and George W. Bush's attitude towards veterans. Michael Moore did not say anything which could be marked as lie, but he did not show the whole picture of these relations, pushing the audience to see it black and white. He mainly did not stop labeling George W. Bush as one who attempts to control as much of the world as possible, placing himself into the spotlight. On the one hand it is true, because there is no politician who would join the political arena without the desire of gaining some power and attention. On the other hand, there is another fact which is rather connected with American policy and politicians more than with any others: It is the mentality of the nation to intervene in affairs of other countries. This political attitude has been present in the nation since the first colonists landed there and based on the policy of present presidents, and their administration, it still strongly affects them. "Winthrop's invocation of America as a special place, where the holy commonwealth of

Massachusetts would be as ‘a city upon a hill’, a model for the rest of mankind, underlined the importance of America’s role in the world, from the earliest days of colonial foundation.” (Campbell 1997, 244)

Based on the whole analysis, it can be concluded that Michael Moore did not make *Fahrenheit 9/11* as a documentary film, but actually a docu-ganda. For that reason the audience should be aware of its propagandistic tactics and take a cautious approach to the film. It should not be presented as a documentary film, because those do not have any ulterior motives. Documentary films, as well as docu-gandas, are made in order to influence the public, but with the difference being the documentary genre as such should not use any deceitful and unreal practice. Michael Moore does not do that in *Fahrenheit 9/11*, and therefore the film should be treated, and presented to the public, with rather negative markings and labeled as a docu-ganda.

References:

Primary source:

Fahrenheit 9/11. Directed by Michael Moore. 2004. United States: Lions Gate Films, IFC Films, Dog Eat Dog Films, 2004. DVD.

Secondary sources:

Alexander, Alison, and Jarice Hanson. 1995. *Taking Sides: Clashing Views on Controversial Issues in Mass Media and Society*. Connecticut: The Dushkin Publishing Group, Inc.

Althusser, Louis. 1971. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Accessed July 5, 2013.

<http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm>.

Arnold, Mathew. 1932. *Culture and Anarchy*. Cambridge: The University Press.

BBC News. 2013. "US shale oil supply shock shifts global power balance." Accessed July 15, 2013. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-22524597>.

Baudrillard, J. 1985. "The Ecstasy of Communication." In H. Foster ed. *Postmodern culture*. London: Pluto. 126-134.

Bekk, Magdalena, and Matthias Spörrle. 2010. "The Influence of Perceived Personality Characteristics on Positive Attitude Towards and Suitability of a Celebrity as a Marketing Campaign Endorser." *The Open Psychology Journal* 3: 54 – 66.

Bodley, John H. 1997. *Cultural anthropology: tribes, states, and the global system*. California: Mayfield Pub. Co.

- Bogart, Leo. 1995. *Commercial Culture: the media system and the public interest*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bradshaw, Peter. 2004. "Fahrenheit 9/11". *The Guardian*. Accessed September 15, 2013. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/theguardian/2004/jul/09/1>.
- Burns, L.S. 2002. *Understanding Journalism*. London: Routledge.
- Butcher S. H. trans. 2000. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Pennsylvania: Penn State Electronic Classics.
- Campbell, Neil, and Alasdair Kean. 1997. *American Cultural Studies: An Introduction to American Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Clinton, Paul. 2004. "'Fahrenheit' a powerful, fiery film." *CNN*. Accessed August 15, 2013. <http://edition.cnn.com/2004/SHOWBIZ/Movies/06/24/review.fahrenheit/>.
- Cristian, Réka M., and Zoltán Dragon. 2008. *Encounters of the Filmic Kind: Guidebook to Film Theories*. Szeged: JATEPress.
- Congress of the USA. 2001. *The USA Patriot Act*. Accessed September 21, 2013. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ56/pdf/PLAW-107publ56.pdf>.
- Congress of the USA. 2008. *Hubbard Act*. Accessed July 16, 2013. <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-110publ317/html/PLAW-110publ317.htm>.
- Cortini, Michaela, Antonella Vicenti, and Riccardo Giorgio Zuffo. 2010. "Celebrity Endorsement and Congruence: An Experimental Study". *The International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences* (5) 8: 325 – 336.

Cox, Geoffrey. 2011. "Connecting hearing to viewing and knowing to feeling: Sound as evocation in non-fiction film with particular reference to *No Escape*" *The Soundtrack* (4) 1: 43 – 63.

Davidson, Drew. 2012. "Media & Genre" *Waxebbb.com*. Accessed December 25, 2013. <http://waxebbb.com/writings/sib1/1mediagenre.html>.

First Freedom Center. 2013. "Religious Freedom Documents". Accessed February 26, 2013. <http://www.firstfreedom.org/religiousfree/religfreedocs.html>.

Franklin, Benjamin. 1758. *Poor Richard's Almanack*. Accessed July 11, 2013. http://www.unsv.com/voanews/specialenglish/scripts/2010/11/07/0040/Poor_Richard%27s_Almanack_by_Franklin_Benjamin.pdf.

George W. Bush Institute. 2013. "George W. Bush Institute Supports Economic Prosperity for Veterans." Accessed July 16, 2013. <http://www.bushcenter.org/blog/2013/02/27/george-w-bush-institute-supports-economic-prosperity-veterans>.

Giles, David. 2003. *Media Psychology*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Glyndŵr University. 2012. "Realism and the Contexts of the Media". Accessed October 25, 2013. http://www.glyndwr.ac.uk/rdoover/med-stud/realism_.htm.

Grodal, Torben. 2002. "The Experience of Realism in Audiovisual Representation." In *Reality and Realism in Film and Media* 2002, edited by Anne Jerslev, 67 – 92. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Hawkes, Terence. 2003. *Structuralism and Semiotics*. New York: Routledge.

- Jowett, Garth S., and Victoria O'Donnell. 2012. *Propaganda and Persuasion*. London: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Kermode, Mark. 2004. "All blunderbuss and bile". *The Guardian*. Accessed August 28, 2013. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2004/jul/11/markkermode>.
- Kipnis, Jill. 2004. "Buyers Demand More Documentary DVDs." *Billboard* (116) 8: 42-42.
- Kopel, Dave. 2005. "Fifty-nine Deceits in Fahrenheit 9/11." Accessed July 5, 2013. <http://www.davekopel.com/redirect/Terror/Fiftysix-Deceits-in-Fahrenheit-911.htm>.
- Lang, K., and G. Lang. "Mass Society, Mass Culture, and Mass Communication: The Meanings of Mass" Paper presented at the *Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association*, Marriott, Chicago, IL, 2012-06-20. http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p297622_index.html.
- Laurent, Eric. 2003. *Dynastie Bushů*. Praha: Euromedia Group and Knižní klub.
- Lloyd, Robert. 2007. "The Art of the Documentary; Truth, the Franchise; Michael Moore and Ken Burns: Opposites, Soul Mates. Yet Like their Medium, that just Tells Part of the Story." *Los Angeles Times*, August 05, 0-E.1.
- Lyotard, Jean-Francois. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press.
- Martinez, Luis, and Amy Bingham. 2011. "US Veterans: By the Numbers." *Abs News*. Accessed July 17, 2013. <http://abcnews.go.com/Politics/us-veterans-numbers/story?id=14928136#4>.

- McLuhan, Marshall. 1967. *The Medium is the Message*. London: Penguin Books.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 2011. *Jak rozumět médiím*. Praha: Mladá fronta.
- Military Hub: Money, Education, Lifestyle. 2011. "Hubbard Act Ensures Benefits and Bonuses For Sole-Surviving Soldiers." Accessed July 16, 2013. <http://www.militaryhub.com/article.cfm?id=327>.
- Monroe, Chris. 2004. "Controversy... What controversy?" *Christians Answers*. Accessed August 18, 2013. <http://christiananswers.net/spotlight/movies/2004/fahrenheit911.html>.
- Nichols, Bill. 2010. *Úvod do dokumentárního filmu*. Praha: Akademie múzických umění v Praze; Jihlava: JSAF.
- O'Shaughnessy, Nicholas. 2010. "The death and life of propaganda." *Journal of Public Affairs* (12) 1: 29 – 38.
- Ottaway, David. 2009. "The U.S. and Saudi Arabia Since the 1930s." Accessed July 12, 2013. <http://www.fpri.org/footnotes/1421.200908.ottaway.ussaudiarabia.html>.
- Panchyk, Richard. 2008. *Keys to American History: Understanding Our Most Important Historic Documents*. Chicago: Chicago Review Press.
- Parker, Holt N. 2011. "Toward a Definition of Popular Culture." *History & Theory* (50) 2: 147-170.
- Pear, Robert, and Carl Hulse. 2005. "Bush Budgets Raises Drug Prices for Many Veterans". *New York Times*. Accessed July 16, 2013. <http://www.nytimes.com/2005/02/07/politics/07budget.html>.

Perris, Arnold. 1985. *Music as Propaganda: Art to Persuade, Art to Control (Contributions to the Study of Music and Dance)*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press.

Plato. 360 B.C.E. *The Republic*. Accessed September 3, 2013.
<http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/republic.8.vii.html>.

Pollack, Josh. 2002. "Saudi Arabia and The United States, 1931 – 2002." *Middle East Review of International Affairs* (6) 3: 77 – 102. Accessed July 12, 2013.
<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~twod/oil-ns/articles/research-07/research-saudi/pollack.pdf>.

Potter, Cherry. 2003. "Comment & Analysis: What a Disaster: Documentary Makers have a Responsibility to Inform, Not Overwhelm Us with Fiction-Film Razzmatazz." *The Guardian*, May 09, 24-1.24.

Raines, Howell, intro. and The New York Times. 2002. *A Nation Challenged: A Visual History of 9/11 and its Aftermath*. The USA: Callaway.

Rhoades, Kelton. 2004. "Propaganda Tactics and Fahrenheit 9/11." Accessed July 5, 2013. <http://www.workingpsychology.com/fahrenheit.html>.

Rogers, E. M. (2003 [1962]). *Diffusion of innovations*, 5th ed. New York: Free Press.

Rosenberg, B., and D. M. White, ed. 1957. *Mass Culture: The Popular Arts in America*. New York: The Free Press.

Scott, A. O. 2004. "Film review; Unruly Scorn Leaves Room For Restraint, But Not a Lot." *The New York Times*. Accessed September 15, 2013.
http://movies.nytimes.com/2004/06/23/movies/23FAHR.html?pagewanted=1&_r=1

Sedikides, Constantine, and John J. Skowronski. 1991. "The Law of Cognitive Structure Activation." *Psychological Inquiry* (2) 2: 169 – 184. Accessed July 5, 2013. http://www.southampton.ac.uk/~crsi/the_law.pdf.

Sherwood, Ross. 2007. "Bush Cutbacks VA Hospitals But Praised Walter Reed." *OpEdNews*. Accessed July 16, 2013. http://www.opednews.com/articles/genera_sherwood_070302_bush_cutbacks_va_hos.htm.

Simpson, Kevin E. 2008. "Classic and Modern Propaganda in Documentary Film: Teaching the Psychology of Persuasion." *Teaching of Psychology* 35: 103 – 108.

Simspon, David. 2003. "Francis Bacon". *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Last updated July 15, 2005. Accessed August 14, 2013. <http://www.iep.utm.edu/bacon/>.

Smith, James B. 2013. "US-Saudi relations: Eighty years as partners." *Arab News*. Accessed July 12, 2013. <http://www.arabnews.com/news/445436>.

Stever, Gayle. 2011. "Fan Behavior and Lifespan Development Theory: Explaining Para-social and Social Attachment to Celebrities." *Journal Of Adult Development* (18) 1: 1-7.

The Independent. 2007. "How China is eating the world." Accessed August 5, 2013. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/business/analysis-and-features/how-china-is-eating-the-world-399654.html>.

The World Bank. 2011. "Communication for Governance & Accountability Program." Accessed February 22, 2013.

[http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTDEVCOMMEN
G/EXTGOVACC/0,,contentMDK:21158621~menuPK:3275993~pagePK:64168427~
piPK:64168435~theSitePK:3252001,00.html](http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/TOPICS/EXTDEVCOMMEN
G/EXTGOVACC/0,,contentMDK:21158621~menuPK:3275993~pagePK:64168427~
piPK:64168435~theSitePK:3252001,00.html).

The World Bank. 2013. "Media Effects". Accessed February 22, 2013.

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTGOVACC/Resources/MediaEffectsweb.pdf>.

United States Department of Transportation. 2013. "Transportation Fatalities by Mode." Accessed August 3 2013.

http://www.rita.dot.gov/bts/sites/rita.dot.gov.bts/files/publications/national_transportation_statistics/html/table_02_01.html.

Urban Dictionary. 2013. "Docuganda". Accessed April 13, 2013.

<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=docuganda>.

Verner, Pavel. 2011. *Propaganda a manipulace*. Praha: Univerzita Jana Amose Komenského.

Williams, Raymond. 1958b. "Culture is Ordinary." In Ann Gray and Jim McGuigan eds. *Studies in Culture: An Introductory Reader*. London: Arnold, 1997.

Wood, Daniel B. 2006. "In 'docu-ganda' films, balance is not the objective. (Cover story)." *Christian Science Monitor*, June 02. 1-3.